DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 488 UD 026 590

AUTHOR	Gottlieb, Avi
TITLE	Advancement Programs for Disattached Youth: Do They Work? Publication No. 113.
INSTITUTION	Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem (Israel). National Council of Jewish Women Research Inst. for Innovation in Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 87
NOTE	268p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Compensatory Education; Correctional Rehabilitation; *Delinquency; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Dropout Programs; Dropouts; Foreign Countries; Outcomes of Education; *Out of School Youth; Program Evaluation; *Rehabilitation Centers; Secondary Education; Unemployment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Israel

ABSTRACT

This study of the effects of the Israeli rehabilitation system on disattached youth found little evidence that the programs examined had any impact. Israeli adolescents who neither work nor study are considered to be disattached. These youth are eventually absorbed into a variety of both voluntary and involuntary community residential educational and resocialization programs. Data on the characteristics of more than 3,600 youths who had been enrolled in one of 57 programs were gathered from the institutions themselves, social service agencies, the Police Authorities, and the Israeli Defense Forces. These data were analyzed to explain a youth's post-institutional delinquency and military performance as a function of both individual characteristics and the attributes of the program or institution with which the youth had been involved. Summary findings include the following: (1) there were few differences among the youth enrolled in the various programs; (2) the programs varied widely in organizational and programmatic attributes; (3) youths were neither more nor less delinquent after having attended most of the programs than before; and (4) there were few reliable program effects on military performance. Alternatives to the current approaches are discussed. Statistical data are presented on 21 tables. A list of 100 references is also appended. A list of publications in Hebrew and in English available from the National Council of Jewish Women Research Institute for Innovation in Education is also included. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304488

ADVANCEMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISATTACHED YOUTH

DO THEY WORK?

AVI GOTTLIEB

Publication No. 113

July 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dr. Avi Gottlieb
Tel Aviv University
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The National Council of Jewish Women
RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATION IN EDUCATION
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM • SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים • בית הספר לחינוך

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM • SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

המכון לחקר הטיפוח בחינוך

THE NCJW RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education was established in 1968 by The National Council of Jewish Women, USA, at the School of Education of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The Institute was established with the goal of undertaking research and carrying out new experimental programs in the area of the education of the weaker segments of Israel's population. Through a wide range of research and applied activities, the Institute aims to confront the special educational problems and needs of children and youth from these strata in the population so as to promote their educational and social advancement. It attempts to give them the opportunity to develop their potential to attain social mobility and to participate on equal terms in Israeli society.

The Institute operates within the School of Education and is administered by a Board of Directors, an Academic Board and an Executive Committee. Since its establishment, research has been conducted in the following areas:
Early Childhood Education - Education in the Family and the Community - School Integration - Informal Education - Career Education and its Evaluation - Recovery and Second Chance Institutions - Cross-Cultural Research - Experimentation and Intervention in the School and its Evaluation.

Research findings are published as research reports. A formal report on the Institute's activities is published periodically and updates of the Institute's work appear also in Newsletters.

As a result of the knowledge obtained through the various research activities, the Institute is involved in the implementation of a number of educational programs, in cooperation with government offices and other institutions. These include:
HIPPY (Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters) -
HATAF (Home Activities for Toddlers and their Families) -
MANOF (A Residential Center for Disattached Youth) -
and The Hebrew University Apprenticeship Program.

Established by The National Council of Jewish Women, U.S.A.

Director: Professor Chaim Adler Tel: 02-882015
Assistant Director: Ms. Lorraine Gastwirt Tel: 02-882016
Address: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem·Jerusalem 91905·ISRAEL

ADVANCEMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISATTACHED YOUTH

DO THEY WORK?

AVI GOTTLIEB

Publication No. 113

July 1987

The National Council of Jewish Women
RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATION IN EDUCATION
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM • SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

ADVANCEMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISATTACHED YOUTH: DO THEY WORK?

Dr. Avi Gottlieb
The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education
School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Tel-Aviv University

Publication No. 113
The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education
School of Education
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem 91 905

June 1987

This study was supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation received through the Israel Foundations Trustees (Ford Grant No. 12) and The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education

CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements i

Abstract ii

1. Preface 1

2. Introduction and Theoretical Considerations 8

3. Methods and Procedures: An Overview 38

4. Disattached Youth and Their Rehabilitation Programs: A Survey 64

5. Institutional Attributes and Patterns 97

6. Institutional Correlates of Crime and Delinquency 110

7. Institutional Correlates of Military Service 128

8. Rehabilitating Disattached Youth: A Comparison of Program Effectiveness 153

9. Rehabilitating Disattached Youth: In Search of Alternatives 183

References 218

Publications of The NCJW Research Institute
for Innovation in Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This manuscript is a revised version of a research report originally submitted to the Israel Foundations Trustees in January 1986. Funding by the Israel Foundations Trustees (Ford Foundation Grant #12), and by the NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, is gratefully acknowledged.

Many individuals and institutions have contributed their considerable knowledge, skills and advice to the success of this project; many others have patiently submitted themselves to our endless queries and lengthy interviews. Although I cannot mention them all here, they are assured of my gratitude.

I would, however, like to use this opportunity for a more personal expression of my gratitude to at least a few: Esther Breinin, who has been involved in this study as my assistant and project administrator from the start, and who has done all this work very skilfully and conscientiously; the many interviewers, assistants and coders who participated in various stages of this study, logging thousands of miles, and never complaining even when things got boring (which fortunately did not happen too often); Yasmin Alkalai, who applied her considerable skills to our complex data sets which often seemed unmanageable to me, (though never to her); to Chaim Adler, the director of the NCJW Institute, who was always resourceful and supportive; to Rita Sever, who "combed" the manuscript for errors (although all the remaining ones are, of course, my responsibility); to Sorel Kahan who gave indispensable advice; and to the Institute's staff who worked on the editing and publication process.

I am also indebted to the officials and staff of the following agencies and institutions who aided me beyond the call of duty: the Youth Aliyah, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Ministry of the Interior, the Youth Protection Agency, the data and computing units of the Police Authorities and the Israeli Defence Forces, and the students and staff of the rehabilitation programs studied.

To all those, and to all the others I may have left out due to forgetfulness or stupidity : thanks!

ADVANCEMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISATTACHED YOUTH: DO THEY WORK?

Dr. Avi Gottlieb

ABSTRACT

Among Israeli youth 13 to 17 years of age, some 6.5% to 10.2% (or approximately 14,000 to 22,000) are considered to be disattached (neither work nor study). The varying estimates of the number of disattached youths are attributable to a number of difficulties, including the absence of reliable means to survey this population in its entirety, the wide discrepancy in the dropout rates of Jewish versus Arab youths, and the probable underidentification of disattached girls. These difficulties have also resulted in a dearth of relevant data and research. Statements regarding the social processes that generate the disattachment process are mostly based on guesswork, and involve familiar social structural and social psychological explanations such as low socioeconomic origins, socialization in distressed neighborhood environments, non-functioning nuclear families with high rates of delinquency, debilitating illnesses and the absence of normative role models, and, of course, the failure of the educational system to respond to these and related difficulties - all these ultimately resulting in learning deficiencies, truancy, and school dropout.

A significant number of these disattached youths are ultimately absorbed by one or another component the Israeli rehabilitation and compensatory education system, which is of considerable magnitude and versatility, and which has developed a relatively efficient network of recruitment and outreach activities. This system, which at any given time absorbs thousands of youths at different stages of the disattachment process, includes various community residential programs which involve both voluntary and involuntary admission; it may cater to homogeneous or to heterogeneous populations; and it often evolves distinct educational and resocialization goals.

Unfortunately, this multifarious system has been studied very little, with most empirical efforts being concentrated on the description and/or analysis of one single institution. While undoubtedly of inherent value, these restricted studies fail to do either theoretical or empirical justice to the full complexity of this particular social problem - as the disattachment process itself, as well as questions related to the rehabilitation of dropout youths raise a series of theoretical, empirical and policy-related questions that require a more comprehensive approach.

This is a study of more than 3600 disattached youths (some 65% males) born between 1962 and 1964, most of whom had been enrolled in one of 57 rehabilitation frameworks. A subsample of this population had not been reabsorbed at all. Youths were sampled via a complex, partly ecological design. Data were collected from a variety of sources, including the institutions themselves, the agencies responsible for them, the Police

Authorities, and the Israeli Defense Forces; the services of the Israeli Ministry of the Interior were employed to verify youths' identities, which was imperative so as to enable us to merge files from different sources. The data included a series of background characteristics; treatment agency and staff evaluations of youths' motivations, social relationships and networks, attitudes, and performance; criminal records; and multiple measures of the quality of military performance. These were integrated into models designed to predict and explain youths' post-institutional delinquency and military performance, as a function of both individual background characteristics and the program or institution that had absorbed the youth. In addition, data on the institutions and programs themselves were collected via extensive interviews with staff and participants, with the aim of identifying specific institutional attributes (ecological, demographic, social, programatic) which may account for the subsequent level of readjustment among graduates (i.e., predict institutional effectiveness).

The findings from the present study may be summarized as follows:

1. There are very few manifest differences among the youths enrolled in the various institutions and programs, either in socioeconomic background characteristics, or in the youths' relations with their families, or in selected motivational attributes and other evaluative assessments. A limited number of selected background characteristics related primarily to the level of functioning of the youths' nuclear families, appear to distinguish between two general categories of rehabilitation frameworks. However, these differences reflect no more than trends, and are not entirely consistent.

These patterns cast some doubts as to the rationality of the absorption process in the Israeli rehabilitation system: contrary to prevailing assumptions, it does not consistently absorb differentially serious "problem youths" in different institutions (excluding mainly delinquency) although there may be latent (unmeasured) differences among youths in different programs.

2. The programs studied, and in particular the residential institutions, vary quite consistently with respect to a number of organizational and programatic attributes, which may be scaled on a continuum of "maintenance" vs. "treatment" orientations. The treatment orientation entails the following components: a high level of individual and group therapy activities; student selection based primarily on disadvantaged background rather than on skill testing or achievements; attrition caused primarily by external problems rather than by internal conflicts; a moderate amount of activities designed to follow-up and aid graduates; at least some involvement of parents in the rehabilitation process; and a lessened feeling of dependency and institutionalism among participants.

3. Youths are neither more nor less delinquent after having attended most of the rehabilitation programs and institutions than before, with the important exception of some of the inmates of involuntary centers. Participants in these programs appear to experience disproportionally high levels of criminal activity after graduation, a relatively stable finding which is replicated for a number of indicators of criminal involvement, and which recurs even when we statistically control for prior delinquency (i.e.,

this pattern does not appear to reflect a selection process). These findings lend credence to the somewhat discouraging conclusion that the Israeli rehabilitation system as a whole evinces little success in reducing delinquency among disattached youths, and that some programs and institutions may in fact have the opposite effect.

4. There are similarly few reliable rehabilitation program effects on the various indices of military performance. The recruitment rates of youths from different institutions and community programs do vary somewhat, although these differences tend to diminish when we control statistically for other pertinent background variables such as sex and prior delinquency. There is some variation in early discharge rates, but little variability in the type of military courses attended (few youths advance beyond the basic training course), or in the units of service (most youths join service and administration units). The few and very limited impacts of selected frameworks on youths' disciplinary problems in the army (desertions, incarceration, etc.) tend to disappear in analyses which control for background variables, gender, and delinquency. Certain frameworks, primarily community programs, appear to constitute obstacles in the youths' military promotion sequence. In short, we find little evidence that the rehabilitation frameworks under study have any impact on youths' military careers - with the exception of the likelihood of recruitment itself.

The aggregated findings are far from encouraging; in fact, they appear to replicate and perhaps even to extend the notion generally accepted in the literature (e.g., Lipton et al., 1975) that rehabilitation does not "work".

In contrast to Lipton et al. (1975) and others, we have some evidence for the actual failure of certain types of treatment not only in contributing to social readjustment, but in actuallly promoting social alienation, detachment, and socially unacceptable behavior. While there remains some doubt as to the role of latent selection or self-selection mechanisms in producing these effects, the potential policy implications of the present findings may be considerable, especially since these presumed latent characteristics have not been uncovered by the rehabilitation system itself. Recall also that this study employed a comparison group of entirely disattached youths, who did not perform worse than the graduates of these programs on any of the indicators of social readjustment examined here.* It remains to be seen whether certain specific attributes of these rehabilitation frameworks promote readjustment; if this were the case (perhaps along the analytic lines of the distinction between the treatment and maintenance orientations), rational change could perhaps be introduced into the system. Possible implications of these findings, and alternatives to the current approaches to the rehabilitation of disattached youth are discussed.

---

* This comparison assumes an equivalence of treated and untreated youths' characteristics. As we shall see below, there is some question as to whether such an assumption is fully justified.

1. PREFACE

The design, sampling procedures and data collection in this study were complex and multifaceted; in fact, this study represents the most ambitious research effort on the population of disattached and similar youths and on their rehabilitation programs in Israel - or, for that matter, anywhere else if we exclude a few large-scale meta-analytic studies which relied on previously collected data (e.g., Lipton et al., 1975). If this comment sounds like boasting, it is not (or only partially) meant to be. Rather, the point is that such a complex study warrants sophisticated analyses and reporting; and the present manuscript does only partial justice to these requirements. This report contains the first comprehensive presentation of the data collected in the course of this study - selected parts of Chapters 4 and 7 have already been published elsewhere - with the intent of providing an overall descriptive profile of the population and of the rehabilitation institutions and programs examined, and of drawing a preliminary analytic picture of the effectiveness of these institutions and programs in contributing to the social reintegration of disattached youths.

It should be acknowledged - at least for the sake of intellectual honesty - that a series of methodological and statistical problems remain unresolved, and that the analyses presented in the following chapters by no means exhaust the full potential of these data. Unfortunately, this potential is somewhat limited by data quality and by constraints on sampling procedures. For example, the very fact that most data (except on institutional attributes) were pooled from pre-existing files prepared by various agency officials limits both the reliability and the validity of some types of information.

The fact that the sampled youths were pre-selected by institutions and frameworks and not experimentally assigned to them creates certain difficulties in the construction of causal models - as does our inability to ascertain that unmeasured or unmeasurable characteristics of youths are not unequally distributed in different subsamples, and do not differentially affect youths' criminal or military careers.

And yet, I am confident - for reasons to be detailed throughout this report - that the overall findings presented here and the inferences drawn from them are valid and accurate. I say this with an enhanced sense of responsibility and with considerable discontent, as this study portrays the Israeli rehabilitation and treatment system for disattached youths as basically lacking any appreciable impact on the delinquent and military careers of its charges; in fact, some institutions even appear to have detrimental effects. These findings, while not unheard of in the relevant empirical literature, have policy implications which may not be comfortable or even acceptable to many officials and professionals in the system. The least I can do, then, is to be very explicit about the major potential limitations of this study, so as to provide some ammunition to those who believe I should be shot (figuratively speaking, I hope!).

As noted, the design, sampling procedures and data collection in this study were quite complex - a fact which was of some significance not only in terms of the logistics of the research effort, but more importantly, in terms of the comprehensiveness and quality that may be imputed to the data, and of the comparability of information derived from various sources. Consider the bare statistics: the study involves a sample of over 3600 youths in three birth cohorts, which by conservative estimate represents 25-30% of the total population of disattached youths in this age group in Israel. These youths were enrolled in one of close to sixty rehabilitation institutions or programs, affiliated with nine different governmental or public agencies. The institutions themselves and the agencies responsible for them, as well as the Ministry of the Interior, the Police Authority, and the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) all served as data sources, and these data were combined into a single comprehensive file for the purpose of analysis. Moreover, we conducted interviews with members of the institutional staffs at all levels of the organizational hierarchy, as well as with students or inmates, and in many cases supplemented this information with observational data. Under these conditions, it should come as no surprise that the data on some members of the sample, or data collected from some of the above-mentioned sources, are at times less than reliable or complete.

The implications of this multi-level data collection are threefold. We are engaged here in a task which more resembles secondary data analysis than primary data collection. While considerable effort was expended to improve the quality of whatever data were available to us by cross-validation through multiple sources, the information is ultimately only as good as the data originally collected (by agencies and institutions charged with these youths) permits it to be. This is the source of all three problems: the at times questionable reliability of information gleaned from institutional files, the considerable variance among institutions and agencies in both the quality and the quantity of the information available, and the virtual absence of data which are potentially crucial in predicting social readjustment (such as motivational or personality variables). The first (reliability) and second (missing data) limitations will be pointed out explicitly where necessary in this report. The third problem (unmeasured variables) is, of course, without any direct solution, and should mostly affect the explained variance in some outcome variables. However, none of these problems should delimit the basic conclusions in this report.

The basic conceptual model underlying this study examines three generalized sets or groups of variables, with the aim of interrelating them, where possible by means of an underlying causal structure. These three sets of variables may generically be described as input (characteristics of the youth, his family and community environment; his educational, vocational and criminal career; and the cognitive, emotional and social attributes he or she has developed or acquired within these environments or in the course of these careers); as process (characteristics of and processes in the rehabilitational environments absorbing the youth, such as ecological characteristics, population mix, student-to-staff ratios, absorption, educational, disciplinary, etc. policies, socialization and learning resources available, etc.); and as outcomes (in our case a series of indices reflecting criminal involvement, as well as the quality of military service, such as recruitment, units and jobs, courses completed, ranks attained, conformity to army regulations, etc.). In this report we limit ourselves primarily to input and outcome variables and their interrelationships - with the exception of the data on institutional attributes presented in Chapter 5. At face value, this array of data lends itself perfectly to the causal modeling techniques common in the social sciences (especially regression and path analyses); in practice, however, things are not so simple. A common-sense causal model would maintain that input variables affect outcome variables, and that these effects may be mediated by process variables - all as defined above. Such a model is of both theoretical and policy significance - the former because it enables us to examine the structure of social causation (an issue more fully discussed in Chapter 2), and the latter because it enables us to delineate the net effects of rehabilitation programs (and their attributes) on youths' social performance - so as to infer, if you wish, what is right or wrong with the Israeli rehabilitation system charged with this population.

Things are not so simple because non-random sampling procedures were employed, so that at least in theory differences in the performance of youths from different institutions may be attributed to variations in unmeasured or unmeasurable characteristics - i.e., latent selectivity processes in these institutions.* In other words, the performance of two youths from two different institutions may vary not only because they attended different frameworks, but also because they themselves have different (motivational, personality, etc.) characteristics which served as a basis for selecting them into these institutions in the first place. This problem usually does not concern most sociologists, who utilize regression and related techniques under such conditions in any case; however, the policy relevance of the current study renders such concerns more salient.

The reasons why we ultimately opted to present much of the comprehensive analyses in the form of regression models despite our acknowledgment of their problematic nature, are two-fold. First, the claim that institutions absorb youths with characteristics which either promote or retard social readjustment, but are unknown to the institution itself, is illogical and self-defeating: after all, it does not enable these institutions to become more rational either in their admissions or in their treatment policy, and it does not permit criticism of or change in the rehabilitation system: the argument would that all institutions are effective; it is only the youths who are differentially "hard-core"; and the relevant characteristics cannot be diagnosed. Second, it turns out that even when the non-random nature of the sample is partially taken into consideration by applying relevant statistical procedures, the overall patterns of findings are not altered significantly. I tend to take this as evidence for the relative robustness of these findings.

---

* I am grateful to Dr. Sorel Cahan for helping me to clarify some of the issues related to this facet of causal analysis. While he has not quite managed to bring me to adopt his point of view, he did force me to reconsider some of the analytic assumptions I had taken for granted.

There are two additional potential criticisms of this study that deserve mention; neither can be resolved at the present time, and both require further research. First, we are in principle engaged in a study of careers: youths moving through stages of rehabilitation, delinquent activities, trajectories of military service, etc. Unfortunately, this study cannot do full justice to the analytic implications of this notion (e.g., event history analysis; Hannan & Tuma, 1979), as the structure of our data does not lend itself to such techniques. The basic requirement is for career data to be collected repeatedly over time. We have recently acquired such a data set from the IDF (for example, dates of desertions, jail terms, promotions, etc.) and from the Police Authorities (e.g., dates of criminal activities, court appearances, etc.); the relevant analyses are now in progress.

Second, this study is limited to the careers of disattached adolescents up to the age of 21, and entails only two major dimensions: criminal activities and military performance. It may be argued - and, I believe, with some justification - that the delinquent patterns observed pertain to a peak period of criminal activity among adolescents, and that the military demands performance in a very unique, unrepresentative and demanding environment. In other words, delinquency and military performance may not be the most valid indicators of social readjustment among these youths - especially if a priori delinquency levels are high and military performance is wanting in this population, thus curtailing the behavioral variance of these measures. It follows that a follow-up study of long-term careers, on dimensions such as employment, vocational training, marital stability, community integration, etc., is indicated. Such a study is now planned as the next stage of this research project. As it stands, the present report pertains only to short or intermediate-term effects, and thus to somewhat limited consequences of rehabilitation.

A few final notes on the form of presentation. Given the complexity of the data and the need to be somewhat selective in their presentation, and given the problems of causal analysis mentioned above, this report takes a stepwise approach which may, at times, appear unnecessarily lengthy, but is logically consistent. After presenting the major theoretical and policy questions involved (Chapter 2) and the design, sampling and measures of this study (3), we shall provide a detailed background profile of the sample of disattached youths (4), and the relationships between these characteristics and delinquent and military careers (Chapters 5 and 6 respectively). In Chapter 5 we focus on the rehabilitation institutions, their attributes and the empirical patterns that these attributes form. As already noted, specific institutional attributes have as yet not been correlated with individual outcome variables - primarily for technical reasons. Chapter 8 is the core of this report, as it examines the tripartite relationship between individual background characteristics, the rehabilitation program that absorbed the youth, and multivariate outcome variables. Here we shall also take another look at the problem of causal analysis, present alternative strategies, and make the case for an underlying causal model. A discussion of the implications of the present findings (Chapter 9) completes this report.

2. INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Disattachment - nature and scope of the problem

In Israel, not unlike in many other nations, a certain portion of the juvenile population leaves school and other formal socialization frameworks (e.g., vocational training) prior to the age prescribed by law (16 years in Israel). Many of these youths do not find or even look for an alternative place of education or employment, and often are at risk of becoming truant, of joining street corner and other marginal groups, of becoming involved in crime and violence, as well as suffering from psychological stress and alienation. In this study, we refer to all those youths who have dropped out of normative frameworks of education, training, and work as disattached - without necessarily implying that other social or psychological deficiencies are present, and even if they have been absorbed by alternative rehabilitation, treatment and advancement programs or institutions.

There have been a number of attempts to arrive at statistical estimates of the magnitude of the population of disattached youths in Israel. These assessments vary widely, ranging from a low estimate of approximately 6.7% by the Ministry of Education and Culture (1985), via a more moderate appraisal of 7.5% calculated by an official committee appointed by the Israeli Government to study the disattachment problem (Adler, 1980), to a high estimate of approximately 10.2% produced by several academic sources (Dery, 1979; 1981; Gottlieb, in press a).

These variations are due to two primary factors. First, there are no reliable records on this population, both due to political reasons, and because it is virtually impossible to survey it empirically. Second, there are serious operational difficulties in defining the boundaries of the relevant population, and in identifying and accounting for the factors that might lead to its over- or underestimation. One major problem is overlapping definitions, grounded in the fact that disattachment may be caused by, accompanied by, or lead to a series of additional social and/or psychological disfunctions, such as delinquency, association with marginal subcultures, or alienation. Yet, none of these phenomena or events define or parallel disattachment, so that, for example, the known population of juvenile delinquents provides a partial and very poor estimate of school dropout rates. Nonetheless, we will return to the issue of delinquency below, as delinquents do in fact represent a significant portion of the disattached population as a whole.

There are additional, perhaps more easily traceable difficulties with overall assessments of disattachment. For example, there is no doubt that the school dropout rate among Arab Israelis is significantly higher than that among Jews; in the above cited study by the Ministry of Education and Culture (1985), the estimated difference is threefold. Consequently, a survey of Israeli youths in general, including both sectors, would yield estimates that are approximately 4% higher than those for the Jewish population alone. A somewhat similar problem exists with respect to presumed differences between disattached boys and girls: the usually held assumption that dropout rates among males and females differ may be inaccurate insofar as disattached girls function more passively (e.g., they are less delinquent), and may thus be underidentified. In fact, the Ministry of Education study, which provides the most recent data on this issue, minimizes these differences (6.8% vs. 6.6% for boys and girls respectively). In any event, the size and proportion of the Israeli population of disattached youths is far from negligible; even if the comparison to some other developed nations (e.g., Britain, the U.S., etc., where youth disattachment may also be contingent upon more severe ethnic and racial tensions) is favorable, these juveniles remain a serious social problem in an absolute sense in this country as well.

Let us now turn to crime statistics, which are related though not equivalent to estimates of youth disattachment. In 1982, youth between the ages of 9 to 18 were involved in a total of 7710 known crimes in Israel (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1983). This represents a 28.9% share of juvenile crime in the overall crime rate in Israel during that year. The major categories of juvenile criminal involvement included crimes against property (60.3%, which is 10.5% lower than in the adult population), crimes against persons (22%, or 9.3% higher than among adult perpetrators), and crimes against the public order (10.4%, or 1.3% higher). The latter two categories, which are disproportionately populated by juveniles, are of course also most indicative of the prevalence of unpremeditated aggressive and violent behavior. The overall juvenile rate has increased by 4.5% over a five-year period (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1979); but inspection of long-term trends in juvenile delinquency reflects a less consistent picture. There is no doubt, however, that the criminal involvement of second-generation juveniles of Afro-Asian origin is on the rise.

In and of themselves, these statistics should come as no surprise: juvenile crime rates are on a persistent and disturbing incline in virtually all nations where reliable statistics are maintained -- not to mention the fact that official crime statistics may significantly and differentially underestimate the actual rate of delinquent behavior among juveniles (e.g., Hindelang, Hirschi & Weiss, 1981). But even if we rely exclusively on official crime statistics, the upsurge in juvenile delinquency is considerable. For example, the share of juvenile crime in the total crime rate in the U.S. has increased by almost 30% in the past ten years, and the statistics in Britain and in other Western European countries are virtually the same.

In Israel, as noted, we have incurred an increase in juvenile delinquency of 8.5% over a five-year period. The accelerating juvenile crime rate is perhaps of particular poignancy in Israel, since large-scale juvenile involvement in crime is a relatively recent phenomenon that had been virtually non-existent only 25 or 30 years ago. Israel's first Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, is said to have stated that a first military Chief of Staff of Near Eastern origin and a first Hebrew prostitute would serve to prove the viability of this nation. Both these aspirations have now been fulfilled -- the latter to a greater extent than Ben-Gurion may have anticipated.

From a purely scientific as well as a policy point of view, some of the more important data are missing when we examine raw crime statistics. Specifically, and as we will see in more detail below, much of the theoretical discussion on juvenile delinquency implicates a variety of social structural, social processual, and social psychological precursors which presumably predict and explain juvenile involvement in crime. Unfortunately, both police records and much of the sociological and criminological research in this country provide little comprehensive data on youths engaged in crime beyond the self-evident information on criminal records and court dispositions.

Nonetheless, certain inferences may be drawn even from the limited information available from police records. We find that while 88.8% of all criminally involved youths had been born in Israel, in fully 94.3% of these cases the youths' fathers originated from Asian or African countries. These data are at least indirectly indicative of socioeconomic position as well, as a considerable array of studies reveals that the average family income in households of Afro-Asian origin lags some 30% behind the mean national income (e.g., Smooha & Peres, 1975; Smooha, 1978), and that this discrepancy appears to be affected little by length of stay in the country.

These same sources also reveal clear ethnic differences in the standard of living, level of education, and in political representation and participation (see also Cohen, 1983) between these two ethnic groups. There is even some question whether these disparities have been bridged in recent years. The police data themselves are directly indicative of two additional relevant statistics: first, father's occupational status, which is listed only in some 75% of the cases, is predominantly blue-collar; police records do not even record cases of unemployment, which may be numerous. Second, 68.8% of all criminally involved youths live in neighborhoods officially designated as economically and socially disadvantaged (see Spilerman & Habib, 1976; Klaff, 1977 for the concentration of Near Eastern and North African Jews in development towns in Israel).

These data, albeit limited, point to the disproportionate involvement of youths from certain ethnic and disadvantaged background in crime - which in itself should come as no surprise. Of course, family origin and parents' occupational status by no means capture the entire nature and meaning of the disadvantages impinging upon these youths, and other processes may well be implicated. Nonetheless, it is clear that at least on these dimensions the characteristics of criminally involved youths closely resemble those of the disattached. Again, while these two populations are not equivalent, both their characteristics and the explanations for the causal factors involved in delinquency and disattachment exhibit considerable similarities; and in this report we shall approach the two issues by taking these resemblances into consideration.

Theoretical models of disattachment and delinquency

Causal and processual models of disattachment, delinquency, and crime - which are, more often than not, theoretically viewed as related if not equivalent - are not directly germane to the present report. After all, we are concerned here with the treatment and rehabilitation of disfunctioning youths, and not with the etiology of their disfunctions. Viewed from a slightly different perspective, however, a brief discussion of such theoretical models becomes more valuable: many of these models adumbrate the (mostly social) determinants or concomitants of the disattachment process. In other words, these theories identify those particular empirical variables (e.g., socioeconomic background, family structure and dynamics, socialization experiences, role models, educational careers, etc.) that may not only cause the youth's disattachment, but may also delimit or promote his or her chances of rehabilitation. Consequently, many of these theoretical models dictate the operationalization (where possible) of certain social characteristics, which in turn may serve as necessary covariates for the analysis of institutional effectiveness in rehabilitating disattached and delinquent youths.

Theoretical explanations of delinquency may be found in virtually any text on the subject (e.g., Johnson, 1979; Kornhauser, 1970; Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 1979; Krisberg & Austin, 1979; and many others), many of which use similar criteria in classifying these theories. Perhaps the most fundamental of these classifications is based on distinctions among scientific disciplines, usually demarcating biological or physiological, psychological or psychodynamic, social psychological or interactional, and sociological or social structural explanations. These basic distinctions are, of course, far from ideal, as many of the physiological, psychological and social impacts on the etiology of disattachment and delinquent behavior undoubtedly operate concurrently.

Here, we shall refrain from reviewing strictly biological and psychological models, except to note the following. First, biological, physiological or psychophysiological explanations of crime and delinquency have moved far beyond the morphological models that had been prevalent during the late 19th century, such as the distinctions among "temperaments" or "body types" and their relationship to crime, or Lombroso's work on hereditary biological inferiority (Shah and Roth, 1974). Probably the most significant advances in this area are to be found in follow-up studies of monozygotic and bizygotic twins who had been separated from their criminal families of origin; these studies provide some evidence of the hereditary nature of delinquent behavior, though it is far from consistent and not entirely convincing. A related line of research concentrates on the so-called xyy sex chromosome syndrome in males (one additional y chromosome - e.g., Court-Brown, 1968), which presumably predicts delinquent and primarily violent behavior. Most of this research is based on single case studies; a 1970 HEW report reviewing this work maintains that there is no proven relationship between the xyy complement and criminality or violence. While I do not feel qualified to evaluate this effort, I should note that the repeatedly demonstrated relationships between psychological (e.g., intelligence - Hirschi & Hindelang, 1977; Simons, 1978) and certain social structural (e.g., social class - Tittle, Villemaz & Smith, 1977; and sex - Jensen & Eve, 1976) variables on the one hand and delinquency on the other seem to suggest that biological factors (or, for that matter, social variables) cannot be viewed in isolation, but probably interact with a variety of processes and settings to produce delinquency.

It is perhaps even more difficult to generalize from psychological explanations of delinquency. With the exception of the already mentioned factor of intelligence - which in itself is in some dispute (e.g., Menard & Morse, 1984), the notion of a relationship between self-esteem or self-concept and deviance (Wells, 1978), a number of strictly behavioral concepts of criminal personality "types" such as psychopathic or sociopathic personalities (e.g., Glueck & Glueck, 1979), and the social learning approach (Akers & Krohn, 1979), most of the developments in this area are psychoanalytically oriented (cf. Clinard, 1974, for a general review; and Schoenfeld, 1975, with particular reference to psychoanalytic theory). Most of these theories are based on neo-Freudian conceptions, such as Erikson (1959), Sullivan, Grant & Grant (1957), and others. The most that can be said about these approaches is that their empirical bases are somewhat precarious; considerations of historical and social determinants of individual behavior are also frequently absent. Not surprisingly, psychological testing batteries, such as the MMPI, the CPI, or the TAT, which are partially or wholly based on psychodynamic notions, have been less than successful in predicting delinquency.

By social psychological explanations I mean to refer to a series of models, similar in general conception but different in detail and in the processes implicated, which view delinquency as an outcome of processes at the individual level (most frequently those related to perception, cognition, and the development of normative constraints) on the one hand, and the social environment on the other. This conceptualization may be somewhat misleading, as some psychological theorizing (e.g., social learning theory) and some sociological models to be discussed below (e.g., labelling theory) appear to maintain similar mediational notions. Nonetheless, the emphasis on the individual processing of social information and conditions is clearly most salient among the models falling under this social psychological rubric.

The most well-known social psychological explanations (as defined here) of delinquency, crime and disattachment include Reckless' (1969; 1962) theory of containment, Marwell's (1969) model of powerlessness, Sykes & Matza's (1957; Matza & Sykes, 1961) techniques of neutralization, and, of course, Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory. We will not review all these models in detail, but only elaborate on one or two examples.

Perhaps the most widely known and cited among these social psychological approaches is Sutherland's theory of differential association, which itself has generated a series of further theoretical and empirical developments. Sutherland's conception is also the most sociologically oriented of these approaches as, according to this theoretical model, the ultimate cause of crime and delinquency is cultural conflict - that is, the conflict between two or more groups or subcultures as to what constitutes normatively sanctioned as opposed to criminal behavior; and this (value) conflict is fused with social structure and the conflict inherent in it.

The social psychological component of differential association theory is most evident in Sutherland's discussion of process at the individual level -

in this case the process of learning and socialization. This process takes place in "intimate personal groups" which may differ from one another in cultural assumptions, and it involves the internalization of motives, values, norms, behaviors, and techniques (e.g., of crime and law violation). In essence, socialization is a process that always succeeds; yet its specific contents vary in different groups and subcultures. The only parameters that do vary, in addition to content, are the "frequency, duration, priority and intensity" of differential associations - again a more social psychological element in Sutherland's theory.

There have been a number of critical appraisals of Sutherland's approach (cf., Kornhauser, 1970), concerning his cultural determinism, his misconception of learning theory, and his confusion of culture, social structure, values, and behavior. However, the most interesting implication for our purposes is that, contrary to most sociological conceptions, class and social structure are not directly pertinent to the theoretical explanation of crime. It is, after all, cultural (i.e., value) mismatches rather than social or class conflict (i.e., conflicts of interest) that account for the emergence of marginal subcultures, including crime and delinquency.

Let us now briefly examine one additional theoretical framework, which fits perhaps even more directly into the rubric of "social psychological" approaches - namely, Sykes and Matza's (1957) theory of "techniques of neutralization". While these authors agree with Sutherland in viewing delinquent behavior as learned, they contest the notion of differential values, norms and subcultures as a basis for delinquency; in fact, they argue that societal conformity is prevalent even in the most deviant subcultures. Instead, Sykes and Matza suggest that delinquents avail themselves of various defenses, rationalizations, or neutralizations to justify deviant behavior. Note that the very need to rationalize deviant behavior implies that normative societal prescriptions are at least known, if not partially internalized. Examples of neutralization techniques include denials of responsibility, of injury, and of the victim, and an appeal to loyalties more central than the person harmed.

Sykes and Matza's theory, while not as influential as Sutherland's explanation, is an almost perfect example of a social psychological approach, insofar as it emphasizes micro-social (and perhaps even intra-individual) processes as responsible for the emergence of delinquency. Even though this emphasis does not necessarily preclude macro-social or social structural considerations, it certainly points to the theoretical priority of social psychological processes; and this stands in sharp contrast to the more sociologically oriented theories to be discussed below.

Between the social psychological and the social structural approach, we find a number of theories which describe subcultural value-systems (involving, e.g., hedonism, negativism, toughness, ascription to fate, autonomy, etc.) which translate into individual norms and behaviors (e.g., Miller, 1958; Cohen, 1955). In contrast to Sutherland, however, there are no postulates here as to the processes (e.g., learning) by which such transitions occur. Thus, if we accept the distinction between social psychological and sociological approaches - the former being related to the relative emphasis on cognitive or other individual processes that make the delinquent adopt anti-social values and norms - both Miller and Cohen would probably fall into the "sociological" category. It is this latter type of theoretical framework that we now turn to.

Two not dissimilar approaches must be credited with providing the initial and original theoretical framework for the sociological explanation of crime and delinquency: Thrasher's theory of the development of gangs (1927), and Shaw & McKay's (1942; Shaw et al., 1929) work on crime and delinquency. Both these conceptions are, at the outset, ecologically oriented, in the sense that they attempt to empirically identify urban areas (e.g., city slums) where delinquency rates are highest (using official crime records). However, both theories go beyond establishing ecological correlations, and proceed to identify the sociological characteristics of high-level crime areas, and - this aspect is most prevalent in Shaw & McKay - the modes of transmission of delinquent subcultures, values and norms. Moreover, both Thrasher's and Shaw & McKay's theories may be labelled "social control models", as Kornhauser (1970) has done: the explanation for the emergence of social disorganization and hence delinquency is the absence or weakening of social controls - rather than the presence of social strain or conflict as argued in later sociological theories.

Thrasher (1927) is principally concerned with gangs in general, which is not necessarily coterminous with delinquent gangs. Gangs emerge in specific ecological areas (slums, inner-city areas) which are characterized by physical deterioration, high geographical mobility and disorganization, and potent economic and ecological boundaries. However, the prime causative agent in the emergence of gangs is the weakness of social institutions and controls in these areas; the gang provides a substitute for the exercise of social control and for the fulfilment of human needs.

These gangs may or may not become delinquent, and they may or may not develop a solidified social structure (e.g., division of labor, stratification, leadership). Whether the gang becomes institutionalized depends on a variety of social processes, both external (e.g., conflict over territorial rights) and internal (cohesion, solidarity). Recognizing that the gang is not the sole cause of delinquency, Thrasher also notes that gang members are already preselected on the basis of background characteristics - primarily neglect, disinterest and disfunctioning by the nuclear family. However, such variations may also occur among individuals who had not joined gangs; the variance in delinquency between gang members and other boys in the area may thus be minimal.

To summarize, then, conditions (poverty, mobility, etc.) prevailing in given ecological areas combine to promote a state of social disorganization in which normative institutions become ineffective. The consequent weakness of social control and the failure to satisfy "human needs" create a void, which is then filled by gangs - which may become social institutions that exercise control. As not all gangs become delinquent, and as gang membership is not necessarily coterminous with delinquency, Thrasher does not really provide an integrated theory of the relationship between social control and delinquency. This void is at least partially filled by Shaw and McKay.

Shaw and McKay (1942; Shaw et al., 1929) reiterate Thrasher's preoccupation with the ecological correlation between physical area (various types of city slums) and delinquency rates. High-delinquency areas are communities characterized by social disorganization, which is taken to mean the community's inability to realize its values, or to implement or satisfy universal human needs (economic sufficiency, life and health, education, stability and order). Such breakdown is correlated with three primary macro-social indicators: economic well-being, population mobility, and the percentage of foreign-born and blacks in the community. The latter represents a heterogeneity index, which in turn reduces community solidarity. Race and nativity also represent important explanatory variables at the individual level, as foreign cultures are ill-adapted to their new environments, causing ineffective socialization, loss of control, and family conflict - which in turn promote delinquency.

To summarize, then, Shaw and McKay develop a full-fledged causal model of the emergence of delinquent gangs and of delinquency in general, as a function of ecological and social characteristics in certain communities. These characteristics engender social disorganization, an inability to fulfill human needs, and the loss of social control. The gang and its subculture become an alternative, almost autonomous agent of control, with alternative values and with its own social structure. These values are transmitted within the subculture, and they stand in continuous conflict with the dominant culture (cf. specifically Shaw, 1931). The mere existence of this subculture with its own mechanisms of cultural values and social controls becomes a main source of attraction for prospective delinquents, even when more conventional mores continue to exist in the community.

Two main criticisms may be levelled against "control models" in general, and against Shaw & McKay's theory in particular. First, a certain amount of conceptual inconsistency is inherent in these theoretical conceptions, and especially in Shaw & McKay's version. Social disorganization is a prerequisite for the emergence of delinquent subcultures and delinquency. Delinquent subcultures themselves contribute to social disorganization (i.e., a circular model, which in and of itself is not necessarily a valid criticism); yet they cannot create disorganization, which depends on external factors (poverty, mobility, heterogeneity). Consequently, delinquent subcultures cannot be entirely autonomous, as Shaw & McKay claim; they must always depend on external factors which prevent the community from maintaining effective institutions and social control. Thus, delinquent subcultures never become an inherent part of the community system; they remain an unwanted and foreign element that the community is too weak to throw off.

The second potential weakness of social control theories of delinquency is empirical. The extraneous factors of poverty, mobility and heterogeneity that presumably (and indirectly) contribute to crime rates imply that we should find high and positive correlations between SES, rates of mobility, and percent foreign-born and blacks on the one hand, and crime rates on the other. There is some confusion as to whether these indices should be measured at the aggregate (i.e., community) or at the individual level, though it seems to this observer that Shaw & McKay's theoretical framework clearly suggests the former. The evidence, in any event, is not entirely consistent, though in defense of the social control model it should be admitted that it holds much better for aggregate measures, and that some of the disconfirmation - especially at the individual level of measurement - is related to methodological difficulties (e.g., the use of official vs. self-reported crime), which bear no relation whatsoever to the underlying theoretical propositions. In short, social control theory, while not unproblematic, remains a viable though somewhat underrated model for the explanation of delinquent subcultures (mostly gangs) and delinquent behavior.

The second major sociological orientation toward the explanation of crime and delinquency, encompasses a range of theoretical frameworks which might be labelled "strain or conflict theories" (cf. Kornhauser, 1970). We will examplify with two of the most well-known conceptualizations of this genre:

Merton's theory of anomie, and Cloward & Ohlin's conception of values, opportunities and strain.

Merton's (e.g., 1938; 1957) version of the social strain orientation underlies virtually all later developments in this area. We will concentrate here on those components of Merton's work that are most directly germane to the explanation of crime and delinquency. Strain, according to Merton, is an individual-level outcome of social disorganization or anomie, which in turn is a consequence of cultural and social structural imbalances. The basic cultural imbalance (in modern society) is reflected in the emphasis on very specific hierarchical and highly valued goals (economic success), without similar attention being paid to the means by which these goals are to be achieved. Such an imbalanced culture defines the state of anomie. Anomie itself, however, is not a sufficient condition for the emergence of deviance; Merton adds two further considerations: the universal nature of preferred values and goals, which are accepted by virtually all; and the unique nature of stratification in Western societies, where mobility is possible, yet the inequality of resources for attaining success (i.e., achieving those goals) creates an imbalance between preferred values and goals and the available means to pursue them. Thus, a discrepancy between culture (universally accepted goals) and social structure (inequality in available means) is built into Western society. It is this imbalance at the structural, macro-social level that creates strain at the individual level. It is the specific nature of this imbalance which determines the mode of individual responses to strain. In the case most relevant to us, the imbalance between accepted cultural goals, coupled with the rejection of (or inability to employ) the institutionalized means for achieving these goals, create "innovation", i.e., the substitution of illegal for legal means to achieve culturally accepted goals - that is, crime. We note that in addition to providing an alternative theoretical framework to Shaw and McKay (1942), Thrasher (1927) and others, Merton in essence proposes that delinquency is inherent in certain (mostly low SES) environments, and that social structural processes and forces are to be blamed for the concentration of high delinquency rates in the lower classes. To some extent, it is this politically liberal implication that has contributed to the continuous appeal of Merton's and other strain theories of delinquency.

Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) work is closely related to Merton's version of strain theory, though certain additional assumptions render lower-class and slum-area delinquency as theoretically stable and immutable. Indeed, Cloward and Ohlin propose that the lower (working)-class subculture generates its own set of values regarding the high merit of material rewards which do not resemble middle-class values (which presumably emphasize status). There is no question of imperfect socialization (by the family, school, etc.) to societal values, as lower-class boys are conforming - though to the norms of a different subculture. The strain experienced by these youths is similar to that analyzed by Merton, although the notion of expectations is emphasized: lower-class youths are aware of the societal stratification structure, and of the likely denial by society of their legitimate access to material goals. This discrepancy between aspirations and expectations creates strain, ergo delinquency.

There have been a number of direct and indirect tests of social strain theory (e.g., Hyman, 1953; Elliott, 1962; Hirschi, 1969; and many others) which cannot be detailed here. We note, however, that research which reveals low correlations between low SES and delinquency is equally damaging to both control and strain theories; and that the most central assertion of strain theory - namely, the necessary discrepancy between aspirations and expectations among lower-class, delinquent boys - has received only limited empirical support (e.g., Hirschi, 1969; Spergel, 1967; Liska, 1971).

There exist two additional sociological theoretical approaches to the explanation of disattachment and delinquency: labeling or societal reaction theory, and Marxist or neo-Marxist approaches. The latter is perhaps best represented by Schwendinger & Schwendinger (1976; 1977) and by Tifft (1979). The central argument is a relatively straightforward extension of basic Marxist theory. Advanced capitalism has created, among others, an emphasis on the individual appropriation (and the unequal distribution) of the means of production on the one hand, and economic stagnation on the other hand. The stagnated economy creates a dearth of jobs, which will be felt primarily among marginal populations, such as youth. Socializing agencies, and primarily schools, exacerbate the plight of this population, by sanctioning the same behaviors that are punished and rewarded by managers in the labor market. Since lower-class families cannot accommodate the resultant problems (e.g., via counselling), breakdown frequently ensues, and the probability of marginality (and hence delinquency) increases correspondingly. Here, then, we again find an emphasis on strain resulting from the discrepancy between aspirations and expectations in the lower classes. However, we discover two additional elements in this approach: the appropriation of the means of production as creating this strain, and the implication of social agencies (and particularly schools) as perpetuating it.

Labeling theory is somewhat more difficult to explicate to a nutshell; it is, in essence, an attempt to negate the reification of marginality and deviance (including delinquency and crime) common to virtually all other theoretical approaches. Labeling theory, which was originated by Tannenbaum (1938) and is now most closely associated with Becker (1973), Lemert (1972), and Schur (1971), postulates that deviant behaviors and identities emerge in the process of social interaction, and occur by virtue of the imposition of negative labels upon the individual. In short and perhaps with some oversimplification, individual acts have to be discovered, identified, labeled as deviant and negatively sanctioned before the vicious cycle of repeated deviant behavior (secondary deviance) is implemented, and a full-fledged deviant identity emerges.

Deviants, then, are those who are publicly labeled as such, and deviance is not directly related to social structure or to cultural differentiation - although disadvantaged individuals are more likely to be labeled and hence to become and remain deviant. Crime and juvenile delinquency are of special interest to the theory, as here labeling is almost always public, official, conducted by powerful agencies, and accompanied by institutionalized and ideological processes (e.g., the "theory of office", which prescribes the presumably benign processing of offenders in institutions which ultimately precipitates labeling), and by rituals such as "degradation ceremonies", which embody a variety of institutional activities (e.g., stripping) designed to damage the individual's self-image. Public and official labeling, according to the theory, only serves to deepen the deviant's stigmatization.

Without belaboring the ongoing controversy on the value of labeling theory for the explanation of deviance in general and crime and delinquency in particular, we should note that at least in the area of crime some of the major assumptions of labeling theory appear to be violated by an impressive array of empirical research (cf. Wellford, 1975; Hirschi, 1980, for more elaborate reviews). For example, it is the case that many acts labeled as criminal - such as murder - are in fact inherently so, as this definition varies neither cross-temporally nor cross-culturally. There is also little evidence that criminal labels are distributed "liberally" by the authorities and by powerful agencies (in fact, these agencies often avoid labeling), or that the disadvantaged or the discriminated against (e.g., on the basis of sex or race) are handled much differently by the criminal justice system. It is difficult to escape the conclusion, reached by a number of authors, that labeling theory may be more pertinent to other areas of deviant behavior (e.g., mental illness, retardation, sexual deviance) than to the explanation of crime and delinquency.

Implications for the current study

The preceding discussion was concerned with a brief perusal of major theoretical explanations as to why juveniles (and, with some exceptions related to the explanation of emergent juvenile gangs, adults as well) become engaged in criminal activities. Recall, however, that the main concern in the current study is not with juvenile delinquents, but with youths who drop out of normative socialization frameworks - although many of these disattached adolescents become criminally involved or otherwise engaged in counter-normative behavior. What, then, is the relevance of etiological theories of delinquency to our present concerns?

While there is little theoretical or empirical literature to support any assertion about the nature, emergence and consequences of disattachment, I would suggest that the explanations and variables stressed by most theories of delinquency and crime are highly relevant here as well. As we shall see in Chapter 4, the present research provides at least partial support for the notion that many of the social structural and social psychological characteristics traditionally attributed to juvenile delinquents to a considerable extent also pertain to dropouts. Both populations are likely to originate from distressed neighborhoods, disadvantaged ethnic groups which often evince non-dominant value systems and subcultures, low socio-economic background, and families which often fail to function adequately due to unemployment, illness, delinquency, absentee parents, or other problems. It is likely, though more difficult to ascertain empirically, that youths growing up under such conditions will experience emotional, cognitive and social deficiencies which will ultimately lead to counter-normative behaviors such as delinquency, disattachment, etc.

In fact, it should be theoretically possible to trace the career of a youth who ultimately drops out of normative socialization frameworks such as school on the basis of his or her social psychologically and social structurally determined experiences during childhood and adolescence - although this is not, strictly speaking, the intent of this study. Youths from disadvantaged ecological, socioeconomic and family background are likely to enter school (or any other external socialization agency) ill-prepared, with little or no capacity to respond to the intellectual and social challenges of these settings. In many cases, these children may also lack parental support for academic achievement, not to speak of physical (nowhere to do homework), psychological (domestic violence) and social (disruptive influences by siblings, deviant elements in the neighborhood, etc.) . handicaps. If the school system is not sufficiently responsive to these problems (and it is often not - due to budgetary constraints, manpower shortages, lack of professional skills, and even neglect), the youth will fall behind, become inattentive, truant, and finally drop out altogether. In the course of this process, which may last years, additional handicaps may develop: the youth may lose skills (including basic reading and writing skills) already acquired, become concerned with immediate gratification of his needs, acquire a limited attention span, become alienated not only from school but from other social institutions and from society as a whole, lose any motivation to achieve normatively sanctioned goals, join peer groups composed of youths with similar deficiencies, become engaged in delinquent activities, etc. In short, limited cognitive and emotional handicaps due to disadvantageous socialization experiences in early childhood, which could have been handled earlier and efficiently by preventive measures, have mushroomed into a complex socio-psychological syndrome which requires correspondingly complex means of rehabilitation.

This argument brings us back full circle to the main original purpose of this study. If indeed youths at risk of dropping out from school acquire the series of cognitive, emotional and social deficiencies adumbrated here, and if the disattachment process itself entails additional handicaps which presumably make social reintegration even more difficult, a number of policy implications are inevitable. In particular, any institutional effort to rehabilitate, advance and reintegrate these youths would have to take steps to minimize or overcome these handicaps - and this via non-traditional means, as the ordinary approach taken by normative agencies (especially the educational system) has already failed. We shall have to say more on these matters in the concluding chapter of this manuscript.

Beyond policy implications, however, there are also several considerations of immediate empirical value to be raised. Any study that undertakes an evaluation of diverse settings for disattached youths - as we shall try to accomplish here - must take account of the possibility that rehabilitation frameworks differ not only in the quantity and quality of treatment (or other) efforts implemented, but also in the type of population absorbed. School dropouts who are chosen to attend any given rehabilitation program may have to meet certain selection and entrance criteria in regard to, for example, the length of disattachment, their level of cognitive and other skills, their level of psychological or social functioning, the extent of delinquent and deviant activity, etc. In fact, the Israeli rehabilitation system as a whole is presumably based on such multiple selections; in some programs they may exclude a specific subpopulation of dropout youths from admission (e.g., those with criminal records, those unable to read or write, etc.), whereas other programs may claim to cater precisely to those most "difficult" youths (including those lacking any alternatives in the education system).

Of course, if these criteria were strictly upheld, it would be almost impossible to mount a comparative study of these programs, as youths' characteristics and program attributes would be highly correlated and their respective impacts on rehabilitation would be difficult to disentangle. The present study, however, was predicated on the assumption that such selection criteria, while recited almost uniformly by all agencies and officials in the rehabilitation system, are neither well-defined nor strictly applied. I believe that the findings reported here, particularly those relating to the similarity of background characteristics among youths recruited by diverse programs and institutions, lend credence to this assumption. Now, if the recruitment of dropout youths into these different rehabilitation programs is indeed quite indiscriminate, we are left with the empirical task of statistically controlling for known background characteristics that may theoretically affect the youths' chances of social reintegration, and examine the performances of youths in different programs and institutions net of these effects. This is precisely the purpose of the analyses to be presented here. Admittedly, this strategy does not entirely eliminate the possibility that unknown (unmeasured or unmeasurable) differences in youths' characteristics account for divergencies (if any) in the performance of youths enrolled in different programs. We shall argue, however, that this contention is less than likely on an a priori theoretical basis, and that, even if it were valid, it would make little practical difference to the rehabilitation system, which has very limited diagnostic capacities at its disposal at the present time.

Rehabilitation and treatment effectiveness

Before we move to the empirical part of this report, one final task remains to be accomplished - namely a survey of the major modes of rehabilitation programs for disattached youths and juvenile delinquents that are available, and a review of what is known about their effectiveness. With respect to the latter, I should note immediately that on the one hand, very little is known about programs specifically directed at disattached youths; on the other hand, there is considerable similarity between these programs and efforts to rehabilitate juvenile delinquents. Unfortunately, I am hardly original in summarizing that there is virtually no evidence to suggest that any type of rehabilitation program for this population is effective (e.g., Lipton, Martinson & Wilks, 1975; Hirschi, 1980). This, of course, should by no means be taken to imply that disattached or delinquent youths cannot be rehabilitated, that no effective programs can be constructed, or that all programs have been evaluated.

Since the number of permutations of specific rehabilitation programs is virtually limitless, and since the number of possible categorization systems for these programs is almost as large, I will impose my own, arbitrary classification scheme here and throughout the analyses to follow, in the hope that it will make sense to the reader as well. All categories of programs listed below are by definition "ideal types", as reality frequently amalgamates different approaches.

The most basic distinction among treatment and rehabilitation modalities is, at face value, based on location: within or outside the youth's community of origin. The former modality is most often associated with the concept of "street groups" (cf., Aviel, 1981; Shorer, 1976; Goldberg, 1984, for ethnographic accounts of these groups in Israel, and Volansky, 1982, for empirical and analytic surveys). There are, however, many other modes of community treatment which either supplement or provide alternatives to street groups; some of these will be reviewed below, although most are not studied directly here.[1]

---

[1] They are studied indirectly, however, as many serve as remedial education and training programs for youths who participate in street groups as their primary affiliation.

Rehabilitation outside the community takes place in residential centers, although the heterogeneity of such institutions and their characteristics is again considerable - such as, for example, whether they are based on voluntary versus involuntary recruitment. While not often discussed as such, the preference between community and institution-based rehabilitation is implicitly grounded in some of the theoretical notions reviewed above: namely, the importance of "natural" rehabilitation environments (the community) vis-a-vis the need to remove the youth from the detrimental effects of the disadvantaged community (institutions); socialization processes linked to the economic and social pressures the youth will be exposed to after treatment (community), vis-a-vis intensive resocialization in a powerful and isolated environment (institutions); etc.

Residential rehabilitation is of particular importance in the Israeli context: Israel prides itself with the absorption of some 20% of all (not only disattached) youth between the ages of 6 and 18 in a wide variety of residential educational settings (Arieli, Kashti & Shlasky, 1981) - a rate which considerably exceeds that in all other Western nations, including those with a long tradition of residential education, such as Britain. The emphasis on such institutions in Israel may be traced both to collectivist ideology and to the need to find solutions for the large number of immigrant children in the late 40's and early 50's, who either came as orphans or whose parents could not support them at home. However, immigration has since tapered off, and many institutions that originally catered to immigrant youths gradually began to absorb the disadvantaged, the disattached, and the delinquent. Indeed, more than 25% of the youths examined in the present study had been absorbed by such residential centers, often as part of a very heterogeneous population.

Between community and residential treatments, we find hostels or halfway houses which are usually located in the community, but merely provide overnight shelter to youths who study or work outside during the day. More intimate but conceptually similar arrangements are also represented by foster families and the like. In Israel, hostels are more often than not reserved for delinquents (and at times to predelinquent females), and based on involuntary admission; this is also the case for some foster families.

Most community settings for the disadvantaged other than street groups, are relatively limited in time and scope, and provide remedial education and training and partial (often subsidized) employment for youths, many of whom are in fact referred by street group counsellors. Education and training are rarely if ever certified, and thus provide few future opportunities. Given that a large sample of street groups is studied here, and that these groups make most of the referrals to other community programs, the latter, more limited community interventions are not considered further in this study. The sole full-fledged community program that represents an alternative to street groups are "work groups" (e.g., Kantor, 1984), which involve (subsidized) employment, one weekday of study, and scattered social activities, and thus provide more extended treatment than, for example, subsidized employment programs in the U.S. (e.g., Cook, 1975; Gottlieb & Piliavin, 1982). These groups are also not studied here, but have been empirically examined elsewhere (Gottlieb & Guy, 1984; Gottlieb, 1985a).

If this brief account of community programs for disattached and delinquent youths is by necessity oversimplified, the presentation of residential rehabilitative settings must be even more so. Most obvious is the distinction between voluntary and non-voluntary (or correctional) centers, although the present study indicates that the actual program differences between voluntary and involuntary institutions are smaller in magnitude that sometimes assumed. Beyond the nature of confinement or recruitment, there are numerous potential and empirical differences among such institutions, pertaining to, for example, population heterogeneity, staff recruitment, program and policy characteristics, etc. The more than 300 residential institutions that exist in Israel undoubtedly run the whole gauntlet of these differences; as already mentioned, not all cater to the populations of interest here, and the variability of those remaining is probably more restricted.

The difficulties in making analytic sense out of this variety of rehabilitation and correctional institutions should not be underestimated; in fact, only very few such attempts have been made (e.g., from an organizational perspective, Arieli & Kashti, 1976; Kahane, 1981; Shichor, 1972; Street, Vinter & Perrow, 1966; Zald, 1960; 1962; from a psychological or treatment perspective, Wolins & Wozner, 1982; Feuerstein, 1971; and with a more eclectic approach, Begab, 1980; Bidwell, 1981; Arieli, Kashti & Shlasky, 1981; Milham, Bullock & Charrett, 1975).

More importantly, perhaps, these attempts have not generated a unified or even partially unified framework for the analysis of residential institutions, and have directly or indirectly generated only a very limited number of empirical studies (e.g., Lipton, Martinson & Wilks, 1975; Street, 1965; Zald, 1962; Milham, Bullock & Charrett, 1975; Gottlieb, in press, b). The only consistent work in this area has been carried out by Moos and his colleagues (1974; 1975; 1979a; b), who uses a social-ecological approach to study "institutional climate" by means of extensive interviews. In fact, correctional institutions and community settings have also come under Moos' (1975) scrutiny, and he has identified a series of germane components of institutional climate (involvement, support, expressiveness, autonomy, control, etc.) and studied their rehabilitative effectiveness. The identification of institutional attributes in the present study is based in part on Moos' conceptual framework, as is other work already published on these issues (Gottlieb, in press, b; c).

This leaves us with one final question already raised at the beginning of this chapter: are rehabilitation programs, whether within or outside the community, effective in restituting their clients' adequate social functioning; and if so, which programs work and why do they? The reply conventionally promoted in the literature is that rehabilitation does not work, and it is based to a large extent on the massive collection and analysis of more than 200 discrete studies by Lipton, Martinson & Wilks (1975). While Lipton et al.'s (1975) analysis was restricted to correctional programs only, it was quite liberal in including a wide variety of such programs (e.g., probation, imprisonment, but also casework, individual, group and milieu therapy, etc.). In summarizing these data, Martinson (1974) concludes that "... with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported ... have had no appreciable effect on recidivism" (or, I might add, on any other dimension of social readjustment and reintegration).

However, this sweeping conclusion, as much as it might fit the data collected by Lipton et al. (1975), is not necessarily satisfactory; it is this reasoning that partially motivates the present study. First, as already noted, Lipton _et al_. concentrated on correctional settings and on officially designated delinquents, as indeed did most other studies of rehabilitation. Other reanalyses (e.g., Adams, 1967), reaching similar conclusions and often bringing to bear on the rehabilitative effectiveness issue, often use defective sampling or inadequate statistical techniques. In fact, Garrett (1984), who recently reexamined more than 100 reported studies of rehabilitation using meta-analytic techniques (Glass, McGaw & Smith, 1981), claims that most treatments for delinquents do "work", though some to a higher degree than others. And if these analyses render confusing findings, we know even less about programs for pre-delinquents and non-delinquents who suffer from the "disattachment syndrome" identified here, and who, while at risk of joining a correctional institution in the future, have not done so as yet.

A second major reason to suspect that the general "no effect" conclusion is less than accurate is that the notion of "rehabilitation program" has been ill-defined even in the most careful studies, such as Lipton _et al._ (1975). Any such program is almost by definition multidimensional, although it may admittedly emphasize certain dimensions and not others. It may well be not the _overall_ program that is effective or ineffective, but certain crucial components thereof - while some others may even be detrimental. This reasoning calls for a conceptual and empirical approach that classifies and separates program components, such as the social ecological orientation developed by Moos (1975). Indeed, Moos does find that specific program characteristics interact with program goals and with type of clientele to produce, at times, positive outcomes (e.g., on absconding, parole performance, etc.). In sum, a far more sophisticated conceptual framework than the mere labeling of global "programs" appears to be necessary to study rehabilitation effects. We hope to contribute to such a framework here.

3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES: AN OVERVIEW

The methods and procedures of this study, while not particularly complex, are nonetheless multifaceted and somewhat elaborate; consequently, we shall devote some time to their description. This section will be divided into six parts, as follows: the nature of the population and the sampling procedures; a description of the major types of rehabilitation frameworks studied; data collection, sources, and integration; procedures for collecting data on rehabilitation frameworks; methods of analysis; and ethical considerations.

Population, sample, and sampling procedures

As already noted in the preceding section, we lack a clear definition of the population of disattached youth, and a consensual estimate of its size. Relatedly, and perhaps even more importantly for our present concerns, we lack a precise sampling framework - such as, for example, a centralized data bank that would list disattached youths, by whatever operational definition, from which a random, stratified, or any other type of systematic sample could be drawn. The relevant records maintained by the Ministry of Education, based on attrition from school, are notoriously unreliable, and contain no information on absorption in alternative frameworks, or on the youth's vocational training or employment as alternative normative frameworks.

These conditions, then, preclude the use of any traditional sampling procedure based on individual records, and more generally vitiate our ability to draw individuals from a well-defined population. Consequently, we opted here to commence sampling from the only entities which provide at least partial data on the pertinent population: the rehabilitation frameworks that absorb disattached youths. The nature of these frameworks, and their distribution and location, were relatively clear from the beginning; we did, however, invest additional efforts in ascertaining that certain institutions did indeed absorb disattached youths, and in checking the existence of other frameworks that had not been considered initially. Indeed, these preliminary tests necessitated the deletion of some (in all cases residential) institutions from analysis, while other, community-based frameworks were added. The number of specific and different frameworks studied was ultimately set at 57, including a sample of entirely disattached youths which we were able to obtain from a study conducted earlier by the Israeli government, and which will serve here as a baseline comparison group for all programs and institutions.

The following procedures were employed for sampling rehabilitation institutions or programs and disattached youths therein:

(1) Disattachment was operationally defined as clear evidence that the youth a. had dropped out of school; b. had not been reabsorbed in the normative educational system, unless s/he was assigned, referred to, or accepted by one of the rehabilitation frameworks studied; c. had not obtained work; d. the period of dropout or disattachment had lasted six months or more. The latter stipulation was designed to avoid the sampling of youths who had left school for brief periods, due to legitimate reasons such as illness, a trip abroad, etc.; and e. age.restrictions were imposed, and only the birth cohorts of 1962-1964 were included. The intent was to sample only those youths who were eligible for the military draft between the years 1980-1982 - as the quality of military service constituted one of the prime dependent variable in this study.

Two additional points should be noted. First, the above criteria of disattachment were not utilized in some frameworks, where it was clear that all the youths who had been absorbed were in fact disattached - so that no additional selection was necessary. These criteria were also not employed in involuntary institutions, where again all youths could be considered disattached - in addition to being involved in street gang activities, crime, delinquent and other similar activities. In other words, participants and inmates in these frameworks were not sampled; rather, the population as a whole was drawn. However, in community frameworks (street groups) another form of sampling took place: only certain groups were selected and all youths from these groups were studied (see below). On the other hand, all residential centers absorbing disattached youths were included in the study, and all youths confirming to the above criteria of disattachment were sampled in these institutions. In effect, then, street groups are the only framework in which (ecological) sampling took place; all other frameworks are represented by their disattached populations, as defined by the above criteria.

The second point relates to these criteria for sample selection themselves. As there is no consensus on the definition of disattachment, there are numerous ways of defining this population - some leading to more conservative and others to more liberal assessments of problem magnitude. For example, one could argue that school dropout constitutes a relatively minor social problem, unless accompanied by some indication of anti-social behavior, such as delinquency or truancy. Obviously, this would severely restrict the population of interest, but also put too much faith into official records of delinquent behavior, and completely disregard a significant segment of the population "at risk". One could also argue that school dropout after the age of mandatory schooling (16) is insignificant, even if accompanied by unemployment and loafing - which would again disregard the population at risk. One could even go one step further and argue that school dropout may legitimately be considered "disattachment" only if certain additional processes obtain - e.g., low self-esteem, social alienation, lack of skills, etc. Such a highly restricted definition is probably unrealistic, given that most of these subjective dimensions are either unmeasured or unmeasurable.

Conversely, the population of disattached youths would be enlarged considerably if additional phenomena and processes, some occurring even prior to physical dropout (partial dropout, lack of attention, repeated failure on tests, etc.) were to be considered. This approach would take the inclusion of populations at risk to an extreme, which may well be the correct strategy for preventing dropout. In the present study, however, we opted for sampling criteria which were relatively easy to define and operationalize, as well as easy to utilize for identifying the population - while at the same time minimizing the risk of "slippage" (i.e., of including youths who do not conform to the definition of "disattached", or of excluding those who should have been sampled). While a certain amount of such slippage is probably unavoidable, we are confident that it was minimal here, and that precision was aided by the operational definition employed in this study.

(2) Armed with this operational definition, we approached all Israeli residential centers which, on the basis of previous surveys, information, and knowledge, could be assumed to contain a reasonably large proportion of disattached youths. Spot checks were then conducted via personal records and files maintained by these institutions or by the responsible agencies, in order to estimate the proportion of disattached youths (as defined) absorbed.

Generally, institutions in which less than 4-5% of the absorbed populations were disattached were excluded from the study. Excluded by this procedure were all but one of the institutions of agricultural education, and several Youth Aliyah residential centers. In those remaining institutions and programs identified as absorbing significant populations of disattached youths, participants were then systematically sampled from individual records, based on the operational definition of disattachment, and including only the three relevant birth cohorts.

In the following residential frameworks no sampling procedures were employed; the whole population in the relevant birth cohorts was drawn based on the recognition that this population was homogeneously disattached: two unique residential frameworks studied and described earlier (Gottlieb, 1982, 1985b); and all involuntary institutions run by the Youth Protection Agency (Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs), to which inmates are referred by the juvenile courts. The latter include five fully residential institutions, and five hostels or halfway houses. Finally, entire populations were drawn from seven residential frameworks located in kibbutzim (called "training for the young", or _Hachsharot Tseirot_). Here, however, only seven among the absorbing kibbutzim were selected, as the training, which lasts one or two years, is moved from location to location; only kibbutzim in which age-relevant groups had been located were studied.

The major community-based frameworks studied were "street groups"; here, the following procedures were employed. The number of street groups is constantly changing as a function of manpower shortages, vicissitudes in enrollments and unstable resources. Yet, the general structure of these groups has remained relatively constant, and it involves two umbrella organizations: a unit in the Ministry of Education, and a parallel unit in the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs. In addition, there are several unique street groups which operate under the joint auspices of one of these Ministries and local municipalities; the main importance of these joint operations appears to be financial. The two major units (Education and Social Affairs) claim to employ different techniques of treatment (group based and individually based treatment respectively), and to absorb somewhat different populations (Social Affairs - presumably more disattached and disadvantaged). While our analyses of these divergences are not complete, neither of these claims appears to be fully substantiated: both frameworks are moving toward individually-based treatment, abandoning the traditional concept of street groups; and both units tend to absorb youths whose careers are somewhat more positive (i.e., less disattached) than anticipated or planned by these agencies.

The Ministry of Education publishes yearly estimates of the number of groups in operation; during the years of interest, these groups numbered approximately 60. No parallel data are available from the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs; but these groups are estimated to total approximately at 280 to 300. Another 20 to 25 groups are run under the joint auspices of one of these two Ministries and the local authorities. As we opted to sample groups rather than to study them all, it made sense to draw a roughly equivalent number of groups from both units, to include groups operated jointly with the local authorities, and to roughly equalize geographical location (the two units usually do not operate concomitantly in the same city or town) and general population characteristics among these three types of street groups.

Given the considerable population of disattached youths involved in the two major Youth Advancement Units - more than 3700 participants in approximately 350 groups - sampling was deemed imperative here for both administrative and budgetary reasons. As these were the only rehabilitation frameworks not represented by their entire populations in this study, additional care was taken to obtain representative samples. The procedures were as follows: Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs Units were selected on the basis of appropriate age distributions within the groups; relevant groups were then sampled on the basis of geographical dispersion throughout the country. This procedure yielded nine Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs units.

Ministry of Education units were then matched on the basis of two indices calculated by Egozi (1978): a compound ecological measure of the socioeconomic status of the settlement or town (based on residents' income, education, origin, family size, and residence density), and a measure of socioeconomic heterogeneity in that settlement. Thirteen matched Ministry of Education units were sampled, and four combined units, run under the auspices of one of the two ministries and the local authorities, were added.

Street groups, whether they belong to the Ministry of Education or to the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, are populated almost exclusively by males and geared substantively (in terms of program characteristics) toward the male population. In order to fill the void created by this differential recruitment, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs has developed a framework uniquely designed for disattached girls - the Unit for Girls in Distress. Until approximately four years ago, the main identifying characteristic of this unit was traditionalism: treatment was based on the principle that the Unit's aim was to aid participant girls to function more adequately in the roles traditionally accorded to them. This meant that girls were taught limited skills associated with socialization toward the roles of wives, mothers and homemakers, without necessarily acquiring any skills that would permit them entry into the labor market.

These emphases are in line with the traditional upbringing of these girls, who are mostly from Middle Eastern and North African origin. It was assumed that the acquisition of adequate skills for the traditional female role was more important - and ultimately more useful - than job training. Perhaps most important for our purposes, these girls were not encouraged to join the army - again in line with the desires of their mostly traditional families; and most were in fact not drafted. This characteristic would have made the Unit for Girls in Distress inappropriate for our purposes, since a negative outcome on most of the major dependent variables in this study - recruitment and the quality of military service - is structurally built into this program. However, the Unit for Girls in Distress has developed, in the past few years, a new and separate program for those girls who possess basic quality attributes that make them, in principle, eligible for military recruitment. These girls are contacted in military recruitment centers, and may voluntarily join this distinct subunit. After one year of structured preparatory work, they may then be drafted, depending on the IDF's assessment of their suitability. The program implemented by this subunit is designed to develop basic cognitive and occupational skills, and to serve as preparation for the military service. It is girls from this unit who were included in this study - once again as a population rather than through sampling procedures. Further details on the nature of this unit, as well as on the characteristics of the other sampling frames, will be provided in Chapter 4.

We note that the Israeli treatment and rehabilitation system includes a wide variety of additional community modalities which exclusively absorb disattached youths. All these frameworks are based on similar models of remedial education and/or the acquisition of basic occupational skills; all offer a part-time day program; all are unstructured or semi-structured and informal; none provide any official certification or proof of progress or development; and only a few provide extended social or psychological services. Youths from these community frameworks were not sampled, since most if not all are referred to them by one of the units already discussed (street groups or Girls in Distress), so that they had already been screened in earlier sampling procedures. The only exception to this affirmation are "work groups", run by the IDF (as a pre-recruitment program), the Ministry of Labor, or the Project Renewal authorities. Recruitment to these groups, which entail a 5-day week of work in industry, public institutions or army bases and one day of basic studies, is often entirely separate from other community services; therefore, these youths are usually not covered by the other rehabilitation frameworks studied here. However, a number of these work groups have been studied elsewhere (Gottlieb, 1985a; Gottlieb & Guy, 1984), and it was considered judicious not to include them here again. The data from the work groups study are partly comparable to those collected here, so that in the future they may be integrated and analyzed jointly with the present data set.

The one additional treatment and rehabilitation framework studied here are three residential institutions at the elementary school level, which absorb children who have dropped out of the normative educational system or are on the verge of doing so prior to the age of 14 years. All three institutions are run under the auspices of the Youth Aliyah. Strictly speaking, these institutions do not belong to the sampling framework developed here, as youths graduate at the age of 14 and should then be referred to other institutions, either in the normative educational system or in the rehabilitation network. In other words, youths in these ("preparatory") institutions would have four years of educational, rehabilitational or other experiences intervening between graduation and drafting age - which is directly contrary to the general intent of this study.

Nonetheless, it was decided to sample these three institutions, as we reasoned that they would provide us with a unique opportunity to examine the rehabilitation of children who had undergone early-career disattachment. We reasoned further that most of these youths would, upon graduation, be referred to one or another of the rehabilitation frameworks included in this study, so that their careers and development could be studied in greater detail; this latter framework would also, in most cases, fulfill the criterion of engaging youths until shortly before their military recruitment. Surprisingly, however, this latter assumption was not realized; only a small minority of graduates from the three Preparatory Institutions were retraced in other rehabilitation frameworks. It remains unclear, at this point, whether the remaining youths were reintegrated into the normative educational system, whether they were absorbed by rehabilitation frameworks not studied here (which is unlikely), or whether they dropped out altogether; efforts are still in progress to delineate their post-institutional careers. It is perhaps telling that very few of these adolescents can be found among youths who have not joined any framework (see description of this subsample below). Nonetheless, reabsorption into the normative educational system is also unlikely: indirect evidence for this assertion comes from the fact that on all outcome variables in this study (delinquency and the quality of military service), these youths do not perform better than those absorbed in other rehabilitation frameworks. In any event, caution should be exercised in interpreting the findings regarding this population: on the one hand, they clearly conform to our operational definition of disattachment, albeit at an early age; yet, on the other hand, the events and experiences intervening between their institutional stay and their military service are frequently unknown, thus minimizing empirical control over extraneous intervening events. We note finally that, for obvious reasons, children sampled from the preparatory institutions had been absorbed there during the years 1974-1977; they were thus at military drafting age between 1980-1982, as were all other disattached youths sampled.

One of the principal drawbacks of the sampling frame discussed so far is the absence of any comparison group that might be considered as entirely disattached, not having been reabsorbed by any one of the rehabilitation institutions and programs identified in this study. Such a group could serve as a "baseline" for delineating the rehabilitative effects of all the institutions and programs studied here.

For a number of reasons, the drawing of an original sample of completely disattached youths was not feasible in this study. First, it would have required a door-to-door survey of households in disadvantaged neighborhoods and communities, so as to identify the disattached population. In addition to being prohibitively expensive and time-consuming, this procedure would have been risky and unreliable, as it would have had to rely on self-reports. Perhaps more damaging is the fact that such a survey would have to be retrospective: while this study was initiated only in 1982, it involved youths who had been disattached (or who were in process of rehabilitation) prior to 1980.

Fortunately, we unearthed a survey of disattached youths of roughly desirable magnitude and characteristics, which had been conducted during 1979-80 as a joint venture by the Ministries of Education and of Labor and Social Affairs. Note that this period coincides precisely with the study period as we have defined it here. The procedures employed in this survey will be explicated below; there is little doubt that these procedures were plagued by a number of difficulties, and that the resultant sample is unrepresentative. Nonetheless, and in the absence of a viable alternative, we opted to utilize these data.

We are now in a position to summarize the sampling procedures and their outcomes. We should clarify again that in many rehabilitation institutions and frameworks - with the exception of some community modalities - no actual sampling took place. Instead, the entire disattached population, as defined by operational criteria and limited to the relevant birth cohorts, was drawn on the basis of individual records, or based on our a priori knowledge that the specific institution absorbs only disattached youths.

These sampling procedures required a somewhat different approach in each rehabilitation framework. In Youth Aliyah residential centers, in institutions of vocational training (Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs), and in the single residential school of agricultural education included (as it absorbed a percentage of the pertinent population which fell within the limits we had defined), individual records - located at the institution or at the responsible agency - were examined for disattachment as operationally defined. All relevant youths from the appropriate birth cohorts were included; in other words, while we selected only disattached youths from the institutional records, we in effect included the entire population of disattached youths absorbed by these institutions.

In the following frameworks the disattached population was defined ecologically, i.e., as the entire population absorbed, without specifically examining individual records: Youth Protection Agency involuntary residential institutions and hostels or halfway houses, and two unique voluntary residential institutions for disattached youth. Again, this implies that the entire disattached population (in the relevant birth cohorts) was included. In the Unit for Girls in Distress, we also strived to include the entire population enrolled. Here, however, only a subunit of the framework operating as a preparatory system for the girls' military recruitment (see above) was selected. Among residential arrangements in kibbutzim, only those absorbing youths during the relevant years (i.e., where youths had completed their residence between 1980 and 1982) were chosen; in the seven locations selected, all resident youths were included in the study.

A somewhat different procedure was employed in Ministry of Education and Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs community frameworks ("street groups"). Given the large number of these groups and their instability, they were sampled on the basis of geographical dispersion and basic neighborhood population characteristics; maximal equivalence between the two types of groups was strived for. The study includes a total of 26 groups, 9 attached to the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, 13 to the Ministry of Education, and four run jointly with local authorities. Once again, all youths in the relevant birth cohorts enrolled in the selected groups were included in the study. Thus, while sampling did take place here, it was restricted to selecting specific groups; once this was accomplished, all individuals participating in these groups were included in the study. Assuming that street group size is roughly equivalent in different communities, and estimating the total enrollment as approximately 3700 youths in 350 groups, we may conclude that the sample to population ratio in community treatment frameworks was approximately 7.5%.

Youths in Youth Aliyah residential frameworks were again drawn *in toto*, once their conformity to our definition of disattachment had been ascertained. But the sample most difficult to define involves those youths - identified by the joint government study - who had not been reabsorbed by *any* rehabilitation framework. Again, we selected from this sample all those youths in the pertinent birth cohorts. Yet, as the specific nature of the original sample cannot be determined, the representativeness and inclusiveness of the subsample studied cannot be assessed.

The distribution of the total sample examined in this study, subdivided into different rehabilitation modalities, is displayed in Table 1. These data may enable us to provide an approximate estimate of the percentage of the disattached youths studied here as part of the total disattached population in Israel, in the relevant age cohorts. Obviously, such an estimation must be based partially on guesswork, as neither the size of the total population, nor the inclusiveness of the present sampling procedures are precisely known. Nonetheless, let us accept, for the purpose of this exposition, even the highest estimate of youth in the Jewish population who do not study or work.

Table 1. Number of Frameworks and Number of Youths in Different Rehabilitation Modalities[1]

Modality	Frameworks (N)	Youths (N)
Youth Aliyah - Residential[2]	3	75
Vocational Training - Residential[3]	4	112
Youth Protection - Involuntary Residential	5	173
Youth Protection - Involuntary Hostels	5	43
Kibbutzim - Residential	7	157
Unique Residential Centers	2	222
Youth Aliyah - Residential Youngsters	3	384
Street Groups - Education	13	513
Street Groups - Social Affairs	9	257
Street Groups - Joint	4	232
Girls in Distress	1	821
Disattached Youth Sample	1	656
Total	57	3645[4]

1. Disattached youths as defined, born between 1962-1964
2. Includes one institution of agricultural education (six sampled youths)
3. One institution runs both Youth Aliyah and vocational training programs
4. It should be noted that in order to collect and integrate data from diverse sources - the institutions and the agencies responsible for them, the Police Authorities, and the Israel Defense Forces - identifying information on each youth (usually identification numbers) was required. Despite considerable efforts, which included the running of traces through the citizen's registry, these attempts were not always successful. Consequently, for 486 (13.3%) youths we were unable to obtain police and IDF records; these youths partake only in analyses of background data.

Such an estimate is provided by Dery (1981), whose latest assessment puts this population at 10.2% of the 14 to 17 age cohort - that is, approximately 20,300 youths. Considering the fact that disattached youths are not equally distributed across these age cohorts, with the older group (over 16 years) probably most severely affected, we might assume that the disattachment rate among youths aged 16-17 years is likely to be considerably higher (say 30%); the entire disattached population in this age group may thus number approximately 12,000 youths. The proportion of the sample drawn in the present study, out of the entire disattached population in this age group, thus reaches approximately 30%; and if lower population estimates are considered, the sample may even reach 45% or more of the total disattached population in this age group. Most of the difference (i.e., youths not included in the present sample) is probably taken up by youths involved in street groups not sampled (who total some 3700, only 1/6 of whom were sampled for this study), and by entirely disattached youths who had not been reached by the above mentioned government survey.

An additional potential source of discrepancy between the sample and the population are those youths who have dropped out even of those "last opportunity" rehabilitation frameworks studied here. Dropouts were not sampled here, based on the now familiar rationale that the experiences intervening between their attrition and their possible military recruitment could not be identified. We did attempt to estimate dropout rates, an effort which, however, proved difficult at best in most cases; data on dropouts were unreliable and often unavailable. It is important to recognize that the difficulties in tracing youths who had dropped out even from rehabilitation programs specifically directed at them - and in reliably estimating the magnitude or rate of this problem, constitute an important, though probably unavoidable limitation of this study. Earlier research (Gottlieb, 1983) suggests that attrition rates from such programs and institutions may reach close to 50% - excluding, of course, those frameworks based on involuntary residence - where dropout youths may or may not constitute the most unmotivated, ill-adjusted and socially handicapped group among disattached adolescents. As these repeat droupouts are by definition not included in the sample - unless they are reabsorbed by another program - the present sample may well suffer from an upward bias in estimating the disattached population's performance. Beyond the problem of repeat dropouts, however, we would maintain that the present sample quite accurately represents the population of disattached youths as a whole, and in fact embodies a significant portion (at least 30%) of it.

Data collection and integration

Once a youth had been identified as disattached, based either on individual records reflecting school dropout (Youth Aliyah and vocational training residential centers) or ecologically on the institution or framework which absorbed him (all other residential centers, involuntary institutions, kibbutz residences, and community units), his or her file was drawn, and all background data included in these files were recorded.

There were significant variations among residential frameworks in at least three respects: the location and availability of data; the multitude of sources from which information on each single youth could be drawn; and the comprehensiveness, quality and reliability of this information. We will elaborate on these three points very briefly.

Data on youths who had completed their residence at a given rehabilitation framework were located either in institutional files on the premises, or in centrally located archives to which they had been transferred after the youth had graduated. In some cases, files were divided between these two sources, either by the type of information included, or by year (e.g., records of 1980 graduates had been stored centrally, whereas later records were still maintained by the institution). Records were located exclusively on institutional premises in all institutions of vocational training, in the two unique centers for the disattached, and in the single agricultural training center. Records were centrally located in all Youth Aliyah centers and in the Unit for Girls in Distress. Records were divided between the institution and central archives in the Youth Protection Agency; one involuntary institution for girls had been transformed into a temporary diagnostic center while the research was in progress, and consequently only records of those girls who had resided there prior to this transformation were pulled.

In Youth Advancement Units ("street groups") we discovered a somewhat different situation. In units maintained by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs no on-site records were available. However, the Ministry's research department had conducted two comprehensive surveys of enrolled youths (1980 and 1981); all group counsellors had been polled and requested to provide a variety of data on each youth in their group. We note that this survey was not unproblematic, as we could not determine with any certainty whether all data on all youths had indeed been made available. We do know that some counsellors had been reluctant to reveal information about highly problematic youths, or certain types of data (e.g., on drug abuse) on all youths. Counsellors were also highly reluctant to list identifying information such as identity numbers (which, as already noted, were highly crucial for our purposes); we will return to our solution to this problem below.

Youth Advancement units affiliated with the Ministry of Education did maintain local records, and in addition partook in a yearly survey conducted by the Ministry's research department. We utilized both sources, which proved fortuitous for two reasons: the information contained in these two sources was not entirely parallel, so that additional variables could be defined; and not all youths appearing in local files were listed in the surveys and vice versa, so that both sample size and representativeness could be enhanced. We note also that data available from the survey on drug abuse and delinquent activities not apprehended by the police authorities (i.e., not accompanied by official records), were not made available to us, as they were considered to be confidential; this information may in any case be less than reliable.

Finally, the government survey on entirely disattached youths who had not been reintegrated into any rehabilitation framework was utilized in its entirety, including, of course, only the pertinent age cohorts. This survey elicited only basic identifying information (name, address, identity number), but no demographic, socioeconomic, or educational data.

We note that in several frameworks we encountered difficulties in establishing crucial identifying information (I.D. numbers), which were either entirely missing or erroneous. We therefore opted to submit the entire sampling list (including youths whose I.D. numbers appeared to be correct) to the Citizens' Registration Office (Ministry of the Interior) for verification. This was accomplished by checking selected background information (name, father's name, place of residence, age) against I.D. numbers. This tactic proved useful for all but a small group who could not be identified; for the remainder of the sample, however, we are confident that all identifying information - and therefore also the procedures for merging police and military records - are correct. We also note that some basic information (mostly on age, origin and father's origin, own and parent's education, and father's occupation) was available in all three data sets (institutions, police, and IDF), and could therefore be verified and supplemented where necessary.

Given the large number of diverse data sources, it should come as no surprise that the information on youths attending different institutions and frameworks varied considerably - both qualitatively and quantitatively. First, we have no background data - except those provided by police and IDF files - on the sample of (entirely) disattached youth, and on graduates of the Youth Aliyah residential centers for youngsters; such data were simply not available. Second, the data from some sources are clearly poorer in quantity (less information was collected) or in quality (data collection was based exclusively on the responses of one individual - e.g., the group counsellor - to a survey) than from others. Moreover, the amount and reliability of information collected may, in some cases, co-vary. Obviously, the paucity of information is reflected in our analysis as a "missing data" problem; indeed, a few select variables could not be analyzed at all for this reason. Poor data quality is more difficult to recognize; as a rule of thumb we propose that data exclusively based on large-scale surveys (primarily by the Ministry of Labor and Welfare) and "soft" data (e.g., reports on relations with family or peer groups) should be regarded with some caution.

Finally, different data sources at times collected information on parallel dimensions, yet utilized different and often irreconcilable response categories. To bring just one example, virtually all institutions inquired about the youth's social relationships; but in some cases this was framed in very general terms ("social relationships") and accompanied by various response options (popular, passive, rejected, etc.), whereas in other cases the issue was framed specifically ("social acceptance in institution") using only very general indicators (e.g., positive or negative). Again as a general rule of thumb, different phrasings of similar dimensions with different response options were integrated into the data set as one single item, as long as we did not view these procedures as distorting different meanings, or as violating different assumptions (e.g., in the above case, no such integration was possible).

Data collection from both the police and the military authorities was somewhat less complex. In both cases, we supplied identity numbers as verified by the Ministry of the Interior; the relevant cases were traced via computer files, and the requested data were provided to us. Again in both cases, we requested and received selected background information (sex, year of birth, country of birth, date of immigration, father's origin, and in the case of police records - father's occupation), which we used to validate data from other sources.

Police records included the following information: type of offense, date of offense, location (town, place), number of accomplices, and dispositions: file not yet adjudicated, file closed (including reasons), case adjudicated (including date and decision), and appeals. All files were divided into juvenile and adult status (below and above 18 years of age). Since all dates of all events are specified precisely, these data files lend themselves to both traditional (number of events summed) and novel (i.e., time-specific or event history) analyses; in this report we will rely on the former, whereas event history analyses will be utilized in subsequent analyses. Some police data (e.g., on punitive measures) will not be reported here at all, mostly for technical reasons.

Military records included, in addition to background information, the following variables: recruits' level of education, date of completion of last educational institution, and vocation (if any); so-called "quality data" including cognitive, language and motivational test scores and medical profiles, as well as changes in medical condition during the military service; socioeconomic situation, which determines IDF decisions on financial support and on type of service (e.g., close to home); recruitment status (e.g., regular draft, special draft, release, etc. - all including reasons); military courses, their dates, and grades received; military ranks and dates of promotion; type of unit and type of position during service; desertions and periods in jail, including dates; and date and type of discharge. Again, most of these data lend themselves to dynamic or time-specific (event-history) analyses. Perhaps due to their sheer volume, IDF records presented a number of difficulties related both to high rates of missing data on some variables, and to internally inconsistent or illogical values on others. These problems have not been resolved in their entirety as yet; at this point, where such difficulties remain - particularly with respect to military courses - the problematic cases are deleted from the analyses.

Data collection on rehabilitation frameworks

As already noted, we also collected information on the characteristics of the rehabilitation institutions and frameworks themselves. This was accomplished by interviewing the following groups of individuals (numbers of interviewees in parentheses; all interview schedules differed in content, excepting the first two which were largely equivalent): directors or similar functions in residential and semi-residential centers, including involuntary institutions (40); counsellors and social workers in these same frameworks (82); youths presently residing in these same frameworks (146); counsellors and other staff in kibbutz residential frameworks (19); street group counsellors (64); and two social workers involved with the Unit for Girls in Distress (these interviews did not adhere to a formal schedule). We obtained access to all relevant interviewees but in one of the street groups.

All interview schedules had been extensively pretested, and some dimensions and questions had consequently been added or changed. Nonetheless, these interviews are best viewed as a substitute for the collection of extensive observational data, which could not be accomplished here due to the large number of programs involved.

The following is a brief overview of the contents of each of the interview schedules. Many of the specific items are elaborated and described in Chapter 5 (Institutional Attributes).

1. Residential school directors: Institutional ecology (size, location, distance from nearest town, fencing, guards); demography (size of student and staff populations; and composition - e.g., disattachment, sex, socioeconomic background - of population); composition of staff roles, significant changes in staff (3 years); formal and informal activities, their frequency and the assignment of responsibility for them (internal vs. external); criteria for admission and removal of students; attrition and its main causes; main sources of referral; existence of a preparatory period; decision making (e.g., selection, removal); contacts with environment, parents and graduates; details on

study and vocational training programs; the use of time by residents; professional autonomy; and disciplinary measures and policies.

2. Residential school counsellors: This interview schedule in part parallels the one above. All general questions (ecology, demography, and some others) were deleted. The following items were added: perceptions of institutional objectives and policies; perceptions of own role in the institution; attitudes and stereotypes vis-a-vis the institution and its residents; perceived relationships with staff and students; and job satisfaction.

3. Resident youths: Attitudes toward parents and staff; institutional history and comparisons (with present institution); perceived contribution of studies, vocational training, and institution in general to own development; relations with peer groups in the institution and the community; satisfaction with the institution and its staff, and ability to communicate with them; dependency and institutionalism; relations with the outside community; perceived disciplinary policy; perceived functions of the institution.

4. Kibbutz counsellors: Similar to the residential counsellors' interview, with additions reflecting the unique nature of these frameworks, e.g.: contacts with members of the kibbutz and peers therein; the autonomy of the rehabilitation framework within the kibbutz (e.g., decision making); the organization of time and home leave; the perceived contribution of the rehabilitation framework to the kibbutz.

5. Street group counsellors: Again, some questions were similar to those in other interviews. Unique additions include here: the counsellors' training and tenure (both potentially problematic); the social and time

boundaries of the group; the nature of the contact (where, how often, and to what end); attrition and turnover in the group; counsellor autonomy (a highly crucial issue here), work load, work satisfaction, professional contacts and aid; activities and contents in the group; outreach and reintegration activities.

Methods of analysis

The analytic tools underlying this report are quite straightforward, and require little elaboration. For the most part, we will rely on simple tests of contingency (X^2), analyses of variance, correlation matrices, and linear non-recursive regression models. We note that parametric techniques will be used here without introducing data transformations, despite the fact that certain variables (e.g., number of offenses, number and days of desertion) are clearly not Poisson-distributed. Some of the relevant adjustments - such as analyzing the logarithmic transformation of variables with skewed distributions - are still in progress.

Ethical considerations

We conclude this chapter with a note on ethics. There can be little doubt that this study presents at least one significant ethical dilemma: namely, the protection of research subjects who have provided, without their knowledge, a multitude of data on their background, and on their institutional, educational, criminal and military careers. This problem is hardly rendered less important by the fact that the integration of various data sources in the course of this study in effect created a new source of multidimensional and potentially damaging information pertaining to a relatively sensitive population, which was clearly identified and thus potentially traceable by any interested party.

Consequently, we felt bound both by law and by research ethics to provide for the protection of this population, even in those cases where the data - supplying organization voiced no such concerns (which most did not do). We ultimately opted for a technique borrowed, with certain adjustments, from another study surveying a different population, but relying on similar data sources and integration (Matras *et al*., 1984). This solution is based on a double substitution of random digits for the original I.D. numbers, once by the researcher himself, and once by an independent outside research organization. Given that records on both the original I.D. numbers and the first set of random substitutes are destroyed, subsequent identification of research subjects by any agency (including the research team itself) is in effect prevented. This technique has not been fully implemented as yet, because we are now in the process of selecting a subsample for a follow-up study on post-military, civilian readjustment.

4. DISATTACHED YOUTH AND THEIR REHABILITATION PROGRAMS: A SURVEY

In this chapter, we shall provide a brief descriptive account of the rehabilitation institutions and programs surveyed in this research, and of the attributes of disattached youths enrolled in these programs. We note that, for obvious reasons, certain generalizations beyond any specific program will usually be made, and inferences regarding the major characteristics common to more global frameworks - such as institutions of the Youth Protection Agency, Units for Youth Advancement, etc. - will be emphasized.

We note also that we shall not identify specific institutions or programs by name in this report, and this for three reasons. First, we do not always have sufficient information about each of the specific programs to provide a unique account of their operations - although we do know enough about their umbrella organizations to draw more generalized conclusions. Second, this report is not, at the present stage, designed to measure the effectiveness of each of the 57 specific programs; there is consequently no reason to expose these units unnecessarily by name. Third and finally, this study has potentially major implications for each of the specific institutions and programs studied, and particularly given that most evince little or no success in rehabilitating their inmates and participants. It is therefore considered most prudent to provide the relevant feedback to each of these programs in advance, so as to first enable staff to provide their own input prior to the publication of final institution-specific conclusions, and perhaps even to motivate them to introduce relevant changes in the operation of the institution itself, whenever possible. The mechanisms planned for such feedback procedures entail submitting specific reports to each institution and program,* and subsequently to convene a meeting of program directors and senior staff to discuss the findings.** Yet, and despite these cautionary measures, we obviously cannot prevent the informed reader from drawing his or her own inferences about the identity of some of the institutions and programs described here.

In surveying the characteristics of the disattached youths in these 57 rehabilitation frameworks, we shall attend both to overall population parameters, and to specific differences among the youths absorbed in these types of institutions and programs. With respect to the latter, we must once again introduce the caveat that these frameworks differed considerably with respect to both the quality and the quantity of information on participants that was available in official records. Thus, in some instances, framework-specific statistics will be based on relatively few cases, whereas with respect to other characteristics, some institutions recorded no data at all and are thus not comparable. Needless to say, these problems will be noted specifically below.

We first turn, then, to a brief description of the rehabilitation frameworks examined in this study.

Survey of Institutions

Youth Aliyah residential centers. The Youth Aliyah, which is a division of the Jewish Agency, maintains a large number of residential centers in Israel; these centers share, in addition to common budgetary sources and administrative procedures, also a centralized system of referral which, alone among the residential rehabilitation centers studied here, involves intelligence and ability testing as one major criterion for admission. Most if not all of these Youth Aliyah residential centers are gradually moving away from their original target population of immigrant children, absorbing instead youths of deprived socioeconomic background, children with learning disabilities, and disattached youths.

---

* These reports, in Hebrew, are now in progress and will be submitted concomitantly with this report.

** This meeting is anticipated to convene in early 1987.

The three institutions included here are by definition unique among Youth Aliyah frameworks in that they absorb more than a few disattached youths (i.e., beyond the 5% limit set for the purpose of this study). The organizational referral system is presumably geared toward such a differentiation, directing more disadvantaged applicants to these three centers. These institutions, however, also differ significantly among themselves: for example, in one program disattached youths comprise a clear majority, (some 80% of the student population), whereas the two other centers absorb only some 5-10%. In other words, Youth Aliyah student populations tend to be heterogeneous, but heterogeneity may have a very different meaning in each case. Indeed, we have learned from interviews and informal conversations with staff that the Youth Aliyah institution most heavily populated by disattached youths is (or rather, was) on the brink of dissolution due to student attrition, staff turnover, and general demoralization - presumably due to the rapid and heavy influx of disattached and delinquent youths which discouraged other populations from attending, and which created a severe stigmatization problem for the institution as a whole.

The institutions also vary greatly with respect to other dimensions. While the size of the resident populations and the number of staff are close to equivalent, only two centers permit entry to day-time students from the surrounding communities ("externals"). More importantly, the three institutions employ different educational and training orientations, being geared toward vocational (two schools) viz. agricultural training. Only two centers have a full schooling program leading toward the completion of 12 years of education; this, however, is only marginally relevant here, as all disattached youths are enrolled in one or two-year vocational courses (in collaboration with the Ministry of Labor). Moreover, not all of these courses are externally certified, although two of the centers maintain coordination with the IDF to permit greater flexibility for additional vocational and on-the-job training.

In short, we encounter a rather heterogeneous picture of an organization in the process of transition between two very different types of target populations. The three institutions examined here perhaps reflect different stages in this transition, primarily with respect to population heterogeneity and educational or vocational programs.

Vocational training centers. In certain respects, these institutions are easier to describe and summarize than Youth Aliyah centers, as they are more homogeneous; some significant variations remain, however. Contrary to the choice of only three Youth Aliyah centers necessitated by the differentially stringent admissions criteria in that agency, this study includes all four institutions falling under the organizational umbrella of the Ministry of Labor Vocational Training Centers. While specific budgetary and referral arrangements vary, educational and vocational programs are uniformly run by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs. However, one of the institutions - among the largest in Israel, involving over 1000 youths at any given time - also absorbs a large contingent of Youth Aliyah applicants, and maintains a regular high school.* All vocational courses,** on the other hand, are shorter, lasting one to two years, and are certified by the Ministry of Labor. All institutions also maintain close relations with the IDF, with the aim of extending and applying vocational training throughout the period of military service.

The other three vocational training institutions are considerably smaller (between 200 and 300 youths); in one, the staff-to-student ratio is relatively unfavorable (1 to 10 vs. at least 1 to 6 in the other centers). The institutions also vary in the extent of absorption of daytime students from the community (ranging from approximately half of the student body to one-twentieth); only two of the centers are co-educational, and in one of these girls comprise only 5% of the population. All four institutions are roughly equivalent in two major respects: they absorb a similar proportion of disattached youths in their student body (ranging from 15% to 25%); and they employ very similar educational and vocational training programs, which entail basic education in the morning and vocational courses in the afternoon - although the specific content of the latter may, of course, vary.

Youth Protection Agency involuntary centers. The study includes five such involuntary, residential institutions, three for boys and two for girls. One of the former three institutions has been transformed into a short-term diagnostic and testing center (average residence: approximately three months) subsequent to the collection of these data. Two additional Youth Protection institutions for Arab youth were not included in the study.

---

* A second residential school operates a four-year industrial school.

** Examples of such courses include: car and naval mechanics, carpentry, heavy equipment operation, electricity, etc. for boys; hairdressing, fashion design, and kindergarten teaching for girls.

Youth Protection Agency institutions, both the residential centers examined here and the in-community residences or hostels reviewed below, are the only rehabilitation frameworks for disattached youth in Israel that are based on involuntary confinement - with the exception of a single prison for juveniles not studied here. As a consequence, referrals are made by the juvenile courts, and the relevant procedures of dispositions, disciplinary and treatment measures, etc. are defined by law. This, however, does not necessarily imply that all youths referred by the courts to these institutions have criminal records; the law also permits referrals on the basis of untenable personal, family or community conditions.* Interestingly, court referrals based on psychological or social need rather than on delinquency pertain almost exclusively to disattached girls.

The five involuntary institutions absorb a relatively small population, ranging between 35 and 40 youths each; one institution is even smaller (15-20 inmates). The student-to-staff ratio is highly favorable and approaches unity in all institutions, although some 20% among these staff members are involved in administration and services. By definition, virtually all absorbed youths are disattached and/or delinquent, and virtually all are referred by the juvenile courts.* Inmates in all institutions are subdivided into small groups of approximately ten youths, with attendant treatment staff.

In principle, all five institutions involve a basic half-day educational program, which is in most cases individually geared or modular, and a correspondingly basic vocational training program (e.g., ceramics, metalwork for boys). In two institutions vocational courses are certified, albeit at a very low level, by the Ministry of Labor. One major difference among these institutions relates to the fact that some are defined (including by law) as "open", whereas others are considered "closed"; some of these centers have both open and closed wings or buildings. Referrals to closed versus open institutions or wings are decided by the courts* (as are referrals to hostels - see below), and youths may move from one modality to another based on their length of residence and/or their behavior. The differences between open and closed wings are considerable, and may express themselves on dimensions of individual freedom (the right to keep possessions, move freely within or outside the institution, take home leave on weekends, etc.), the right to work outside the institution - at times even for limited remuneration, and staff attitudes and disciplinary measures. Two centers practice a system of "token economy", whereby inmates are encouraged to engage in desirable behaviors by positive reinforcement mechanisms. We note that in addition to the distinction between open and closed wings, one institution for girls also operates a six-week diagnostic center, following which residents may be retained, referred elsewhere, or even returned home.

---

* Here, however, additional measures such as surrogate families and court-appointed guardians are available.

Finally, inmates of Youth Protection Agency institutions differ considerably with respect to the planned and actual length of residence, which may range from a few weeks to three or more years. One short-term institution averages only some 3 months of stay, whereas the center with the longest average residence approximates 18 months. The interested reader is referred to the relevant legislation (Youth Protection Regulations, 1955; Youth Legislation - Treatment and Protection, 1960; and Youth Legislation - Judgment, Discipline and Treatment, 1971), as well as to a recent report by the State of Israel Comptroller (1984) for further elaboration and details.

---

* One institution also receives some 15% of its referrals from probation officers.

Youth Protection Agency hostels (community residences). These hostels are governed by the same legislation cited above, although it is presumed that less serious offenders will be referred to them at the discretion of the juvenile courts, and that the youths' movement between institutions and hostels is based on rational assessments of their behavior while in residence.

Youth Protection Agency hostels are located within neighborhoods and communities* that are not the residents' communities of origin. Inmates are usually housed in small, detached residential units, with populations ranging between ten and twenty youths. None of the hostels are co-educational. Staff-to-student ratios are once again favorable, approaching unity in some cases.

The activities common in hostels comprise of remunerated work in public and private institutions and organizations within the community, and social and treatment activities in the evenings. One hostel also operates a modular program of basic education, and inmates of another hostel are eligible for a vocational certificate from the Ministry of Labor. Moreover, inmates in principle have the option of attending an accredited educational institution in lieu of work. Finally, we note that the population in all hostels is almost evenly divided between direct referrals by the juvenile courts and transfers from closed institutions - although, as noted, the opposite "career" is also possible in case of disciplinary problems while in residence at the hostel.

---

* There are additional varieties of in-community residences. However, these are not operated by the Youth Protection Agency, and they do not absorb disattached youth, but are designated for orphans or other populations in distress. We note also that we have obtained detailed data only on four of the five Youth Protection hostels, as one ceased operations prior to data collection, so that no staff members could be interviewed. Full information on the inmate population of the closed hostel was ascertained, however.

Residential frameworks in kibbutzim - Hachsharot Tseirot. The kibbutz movement has traditionally evinced considerable involvement in the absorption and rehabilitation of a variety of distressed populations, including some community outreach activities. Of these efforts, only one is directly pertinent to the population of concern here: Hachsharot Tseirot or Young Training Centers. The Youth Aliyah, an organization we have already encountered, operates these centers jointly with the kibbutz movement. These residences are located in volunteer kibbutzim - which may vary from year to year - and absorb groups of 20 to 30 youths for periods ranging between one and three years. The target population are youths 15-17 years of age (depending on length of stay) who neither study nor work.

Seven kibbutzim absorbed Hachsharot Tseirot during the period relevant to this study. They represent most ideological currents in the movement, and are dispersed widely across the country.

At face value at least, all kibbutz rehabilitation centers operate in a similar manner. The group is usually assigned a team of two or three kibbutz members who work directly with the youths in treatment and other functions, and who serve as mediators between the group and the kibbutz. In addition, each youth is assigned a surrogate family from the kibbutz. Youths work in most regular work branches; branch coordinators are also expected to fulfilrehabilitative functions. Youths are allowed and expected to partake in most cultural and social activities.

All kibbutzim offer a remedial education program, although its contents and scope may vary somewhat. Finally, graduates of the program are expected to join the army, and all kibbutzim make some effort to maintain contact with recruits. In other words, Hachsharot Tseirot represent relatively homogeneous frameworks, in which the major patent sources of variation are the length of stay, and the extent to which specific kibbutzim are willing to repeatedly absorb disattached youth.

Unique residential centers. We are referring here to two institutions established relatively recently (less than ten years) under the joint auspices of a variety of public and private organizations. Both institutions absorb relatively small populations (approximately 70 youths each), employing a presumably "negative" selection process, whereby the most disadvantaged (including delinquent) youths are to be absorbed. One of these institutions is the only known residential setting in Israel to employ community outreach techniques to identify needy youths. Both institutions are also intimately connected with the kibbutz movement, referring graduates to selected kibbutzim for an interim period until military recruitment. Close contacts with graduates are maintained during the kibbutz period and during their military service. Finally, both institutions offer modular, individually-geared programs of remedial education, and Ministry of Labor approved and certified vocational training in various content areas.

Here, however, the similarities end; the institutions are as different from each other as they differ from the rest of the rehabilitation networks in Israel. A few examples will suffice: Institution A was located, at the time of this research, in the center of a medium-sized town,* whereas Institution B is geographically isolated. Program A lasted 8-9 months (excluding the kibbutz period) and was geared primarily toward vocational training and special advancement projects for gifted residents; program B in principle permitted unlimited residence (and consequently also absorbed youths at a younger age), and had a strong agricultural component. Institution A absorbs only males, whereas B is co-educational. The two institutions were also connected to different referral sources, with A relying heavily on probation officers, whereas B employed a variety of active outreach techniques. For a more detailed discussion of these two institutions, the interested readed is referred to Gottlieb (1983).*

---

* It has since been relocated close to Israel's northern border.

Preparatory schools for youngsters (Mechina). Three residential institutions fall under this heading. These are once again run under the auspices of the Youth Aliyah, which also makes virtually all referrals. These centers are uniquely designed for the youngest age group of disattached youth, around the age of 14 or less. These children have either dropped out of the education system prior to the completion of elementary school (8 grades, 14 years or less of age), or have completed grade school, but have been unable to find any normative framework willing to continue to educate them. The three centers provide one to two-year programs for these children, emphasizing special educational programs for the disadvantaged, and modular individual programs to promote reading and writing abilities. Two institutions are co-educational, though even here the male-to-female ratio is approximately 4 to 1; the remaining center is religiously oriented, and absorbs only boys. The populations in these institutions vary and may reach up to 200 youths, with considerable variations in staff-to-student ratios (between 1:2 and 1:4). Children are divided into smaller social groups of approximately 20 members each.

---

* It is important to note that these descriptions, especially of institutions surveyed up to this point, pertain to conditions as they obtained at the time of data collection. The rehabilitation system as a whole, and some of these institutions in particular, are in a continuous state of flux, and both populations and program characteristics are likely to change even within a short period. We have already alluded to some of these changes, e.g., admissions criteria in some Youth Aliyah centers, the transformation of one of the Youth Protection Agency institutions into a diagnostic center, the change in specific kibbutzim absorbing Hachsharot Tseirot, etc. One of the unique centers described here is now in the process of "improving" the profile of the population it absorbs. In any event, the present survey is not intended to provide an up-to-date description of the rehabilitation system, but rather to convey the situation as we (and the youths studied) encountered it while this research was in progress.

The reader may recall that our initial interest in these institutions was related to the early absorption age: these are in fact the only rehabilitation frameworks in Israel geared toward the very young who are at the initial phases of the disattachment process. Of course, from a methodological point of view, there is a price to be paid for the inclusion of these Mechinot in the study: graduation ensues at age 15 or so, and a great variety of experiences may intervene between this stage and military induction. The Youth Aliyah assumes that most of these graduates will be integrated into other frameworks, rehabilitational or normative. If this had been the case, we would have been able to trace most of these youths in the institutions and programs studied. Unfortunately and surprisingly, these institutions do relatively little to follow-up their graduates, or to make sure that they indeed integrate into frameworks of continuing education. Follow-up is weak despite the fact that most of these children are expected to attend Youth Aliyah institutions after graduation. Moreover, our own data indicate that most of these youths are, in fact, not absorbed by any of the frameworks studied here. It remains unclear whether the remaining children are able to return to the normative education system, or whether they proceed to drop out altogether.

Youth Advancement Units (street groups). As already noted, street groups are run under the auspices of two different ministries (Education and Culture; Labor and Social Affairs), as well as under various combinations of local municipalities and these ministries. Despite claims to the contrary, pertaining presumably to differential group (Education) versus individual (Social Affairs) orientations in treatment, we have found little evidence that these different groups vary on any significant dimension, such as treatment (which is predominantly individual), sex composition (almost exclusively male), intensity of activities, outreach techniques, group size, or contacts with other community agencies (e.g., referral to jobs, community schools, etc.). In fact, the variations among local groups within each agency appear to be more significant than those between Ministry of Education and Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs units. Consequently, and at least for the purpose of description, we shall treat these different types of Youth Advancement units as equivalent, though we shall later proceed to analyze them separately.

There are a total of approximately 320 such units in operation at any given time, most (some 240) under the auspices of the Ministry of Education. More than 3700 youths from over 90 city neighborhoods and development towns are involved, again divided unequally between the two ministries. Ministry of Education vs. Labor and Social Affairs units, while basically equivalent on most dimensions, differ in three aspects of potential significance: the latter office exercises greater financial and policy control over its local counsellors; education and job-specific training are less prevalent and extensive in Labor and Social Affairs Units; and its youth population is somewhat more disadvantaged - as we shall see later in this chapter.

In all Youth Advancement units, regardless of sponsorship, the following emphases are evident: the attempt to absorb both youths who have already dropped out of normative frameworks and may or may not be delinquent, and those who may be considered "at high risk" to embark on such a career; an emphasis on outreach activities, recognizing the units' inability to approach youths otherwise; an emphasis on individual interactions and treatment, as opposed to the traditional group-based approach; and community-based activities designed to re-enroll youths in normative frameworks, or at least to find alternatives in compensatory education or on-the-job training.

The inclusion of individuals at risk and the effort to find educational and employment opportunities for youths in these groups also account in part to the repeated finding that only some 30% of street group members are entirely disattached (e.g. Volansky & Kfir, 1982).

Work in youth advancement units is based on the following central principles: the autonomy of the group counsellor; his concentration on referring youths to relevant learning and employment experiences and activities (rather than creating them or substituting for them); the informal nature of the youth-counsellor interaction, including the frequently "natural" environment of this interaction; and the necessity of creating mutual trust and closeness as an imperative for the success of this type of informal, unstructured treatment. For a further elaboration of this treatment modality and a summary of relevant evaluation studies, see also Druck & Adler, 1984.

Finally, and as already noted, the variability among units operating under the auspices of one ministry often appears to overshadow differences between the two types of programs. Reports issued over the years by the Ministry of Education and Culture, for example, indicate that its street groups, by virtue of being located in different areas, are connected to different school systems and other educational or vocational training institutions, and to different types of job-providers; they also tend to employ different techniques of outreach and treatment, maintain differential ties with juvenile courts and with the IDF, have different policies regarding minimal and maximal age limits for absorption, etc. In short, we find once again that it is difficult to discern internally consistent policies and applications in rehabilitation units officially defined as homogeneous.

Unit for Girls in Distress. This unit had originally been established as a result of the perceived need for community treatment of disattached girls, which had not been fulfilled by the all-male street groups. The initial assumptions in establishing this unit had been (a) that there is a significant component of untreated disattached girls in the community; (b) that there are few community agencies to absorb them and that the existing agencies were unsuitable to confront the unique problems of disattached girls; (c) that the option of residential absorption of these girls had been exhausted, since many families were unwilling to send their daughters outside the community; and (d) that only limited change could be induced via community treatment, as these girls were under the considerable influence of their nuclear families which, in turn, emphasized traditional upbringing and clearly preferred socialization toward the traditional roles of wife, homemaker and mother. Consequently, the unit chose to adhere to these conceptions, to provide girls with elementary education, and to prepare them for their anticipated roles.

The unit absorbs girls ranging widely in age (13-21), in part via self-referral and in part via outreach activities. Certain distinctions among subpopulations are made (e.g. "girls at risk to become delinquent"), but by and large the population is disattached as defined here. The treatment ideology is individualistic (rather than group-oriented), with special emphasis on informal interactions, referral to medical treatment, and to limited vocational training (by outside agencies, as is the case for street groups). Additional details may be found in Druck & Adler (1984).

The Unit for Girls in Distress as a whole is unsuitable for this study, as it made no real attempt to promote the girls' willingness to join the IDF. In fact, in this area as well as in many others (especially preferences for the traditional roles of housewife and mother, versus professional advancement and participation in the labor force), the unit tended to adhere to the girls' preferences which in turn were often a derivative of their families' stipulations. As most of these families were traditionally motivated, the apriori probability that these girls' would (often successfully) avoid recruitment was high; and it was not lowered by their participation in the program. Consequently, their probability of success on one of the primary dependent variables in this study (recruitment) was by definition lower than that of girls in the other frameworks studied.

However, in 1979 the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs established a subunit which tried to reach girls during the military recruitment process (age 17), select those on or slightly under the borderline of IDF selection policies (based on ability and other quality measures), and convince them to join the unit and receive a one-year compound program of treatment, elementary education, and vocational training coordinated with the IDF's needs. The program raises IDF ability ratings sufficiently to enable many of these girls to join the army after graduation from the unit. We must take into consideration, of course, that this subunit is partially self-selected, both due to the constraints imposed on ability ratings, and because it is entirely voluntary.

Disattached Youths. We have little to add here beyond the general description in Chapter 3. These are youths sampled in a joint study by the Ministries of Education and of Social Affairs, in 1979-1980, who had dropped out of the educational system, and who had failed to find alternative frameworks either in the mainstream, or in the rehabilitation system, or on the job market. As such, this sample ostensibly constitutes an ideal comparison group in this study ("no treatment"); however, its value is diminished by faulty sampling procedures.

The survey represented a highly ambitious undertaking, and not only because it entailed an unusual case of cooperation between two government agencies not known for their history of joint action. The intent was to charge local community workers, with the aid and under the auspices of the relevant municipalities, with conducting a door-to-door survey of households with adolescent boys and girls in distressed urban neighborhoods and development towns. Survey questions were designed to delineate the educational and/or vocational activities of these youths, thereby identifying those who had dropped out of all normative frameworks - i.e. were disattached. Obviously, had this effort been successful, it would not only have provided the necessary sampling frame and data base for this study but equipped the system with the information crucial for the identification and reintegration of these youths.

Unfortunately, the survey was, at the very best, a partial failure. There are no written records of the procedures of this study or their implementation (except the computer files on youths who were, in fact, surveyed) and we have to rely on verbal reports of the Ministry officials who conducted it. This feedback suggests two main reasons for the survey's limited success: the lack of cooperation by local municipalities, due to which the survey simply was not carried out or not completed in various localities; and the evident lack of cooperation in individual households, where parents frequently had good reasons for denying that their children were disattached. Given the insufficient records on the survey, we cannot determine to what extent these problems affected the validity, reliability and completeness of the data (although it is clear that they did). Nonetheless, we felt that the inclusion of these survey data were preferable to having no comparison group at all, especially since mounting a similar and more valid survey in the course of this study was untenable.

Survey of the Population

One of the most basic aims in this study, in addition to the attempt to draw conclusions about rehabilitation effectiveness, was to provide an optimal(given the quality of the data) description of the population of disattached youth itself. The need for such a description was felt especially since we know relatively little about this quite large segment of the adolescent population, and given that our current information is fragmented, unreliable, and pertinent only to very limited dimensions of the problem.

As these data were collected from institutional and agency files - which in and of themselves are often fragmented, unreliable and inconsistent - the information displayed here is necessarily bound by these limitations. While efforts were made to verify various bits of information by cross-validating them via different files, certain data remain suspect - either due to questionable file maintenance, or because the considerable variations in data collection among institutions often decrease the effective sample size, and render certain statistics less representative. This is particularly the case with respect to more "elusive" measures which are based primarily on staff probes into the youth's past, or on subjective evaluations of his or her performance or integration. Consequently, in evaluating the data presented in Tables 2-4, we must proceed with these caveats in mind.

Table 2 displays central parental and family background characteristics, which are all based on objective information. Statistics for population parameters, based on Central Bureau of Statistics (1984) data, are provided for comparison purposes, where available. Most of the data on the disattached population are based on the complete or almost complete sample of N = 3645.

In general, the data displayed in Table 2 should come as no surprise. Youths from Asian and African origin are disproportionally represented among the disattached. Moreover, and as one would expect, ethnic origin is highly correlated with the major components of socioeconomic status - education, occupation, and income. In other words, disattached youths are disproportionately likely to orginate from families from Asian or African origin, with low levels of education and income, and with a high level of occupational instability. It appears, then - and this is again not surprising - that the process of disattachment, with all its correlates, is related to the nuclear family's position within the social structure, which in turn prescribes and constricts the child's opportunity structure. Moreover, some specific difficulties in family functioning (e.g., illness, delinquency, etc.)

Table 2. Selected Background Characteristics (I) - Parents and Family

Attribute	Distribution	Equivalent Parameter in Population[1]
Father's Origin (Asia-Africa)	82.4%	47.3%
Mother's Origin (Asia-Africa)	86.0%	43.1%
Father's Education (None)	23.2%	6.5%
(elementary)	57.8%	29.5%
Mother's Education (None)	39.2%	8.8%
(elementary)	43.1%	28.3%
Father's Occupation (unstable or unemployed)	31.4%	N.A.[2]
Mother's Occupation (unstable or unemployed)	9.5%	N.A.[2]
No. of Siblings (7 or more)	44.7%	3.8[3]
Family Income (bottom 10%)	64.3%	N.A.[2]
Type of Family (one-parent; divorce or death)	23.1%	N.A.[2]
Delinquents in Nuclear Family	5.2%[4]	0.1%
Limiting Illness in Nuclear Family	14.5%[4]	N.A.[2]

1. All percentages based on population parameters in same age group (Central Bureau of Statistics, 1984).
2. Not available entirely, or in desired form.
3. Average size of family unit, 1983.
4. Based on less than total sample (N=3645).

appear to be relatively prevalent, although comparative population parameters are not always available. This would imply that not only social structural position, but specific family disfunctions may affect the child's career toward disattachment - a point to which we shall return below.

Table 3. Selected Background Characteristics (II) - Sociodemographic Attributes

Attribute	Distribution	Equivalent Parameter in Population[1]
Youth's Sex	M=61.8% F=38.2%	--
Education (none)	2.8%	0.3%
(elementary)	24.8%	11.2%
Previous Rehabilitation Framework (one or more)	12.2%	IRR[2]
Youth's Residence (not with nuclear family)	5.2%	N.A.[3]
Mental Illness (indications)	9.6%[5]	N.A.[3]
Suicide Attempts	3.0%[5]	N.A.[3]
Known Offenses	44.1%	1.3%[4]

1. See Footnote 1, Table 2.
2. Irrelevant.
3. See Footnote 2, Table 2.
4. Percentage refers to crime rate (police files) in 1984. The conviction rate for these offenses and age cohorts in Israel is low, since many files are closed even before reaching the juvenile courts.
5. See Footnote 4, Table 2.

In sum, disattached youths originate from disadvantaged families who are deficient in crucial indicators of social attainment, and who exhibit a variety of constraining disfunctions. The extent to which this relationship is causal or exclusive is one of the questions to be addressed in this study. These families are relatively homogeneous in origin, level of education, and placement in secondary labor market positions (Bonacich, 1972; 1979; Doeringer & Piore, 1971; Edwards *et al.*, 1975; Porter & Bach, 1978).

Despite their low incomes, almost 50% have to cope with families of seven or more children, and in close to 25% of the cases, one of the parents is entirely absent or not functioning. As a norm, these are hardly the circumstances under which well-adjusted children would grow up.

Table 3 displays selected background characteristics of the youths themselves; population parameters tend to be less available for these variables. Again, there are no major surprises. We note the unequal representation of males and females in the sample, which, however, may reflect less on the sex composition of disattached youth than on the differential outreach and absorption capabilities of the rehabilitation system. While the low level of educational attainment is almost by definition a characteristic of this population, it is still noteworthy that fully 2.8% claim no schooling at all - this in a country which claims virtually full literacy. Most of the remaining characteristics displayed in Table 3 reflect components of the disattachment process itself: the "revolving door syndrome" of moving from institution to institution; a certain amount of truancy or other processes causing detachment from the nuclear family; and, of course, expressions of deviant behavior such as mental illness, suicide attempts, and primarily criminal offenses.

Table 4 displays several additional characteristics of the sampled youths; these are based on psychologists' and social workers' evaluation of the youth's functioning while in residence. These data are somewhat suspect for obvious reasons, such as inconsistencies across institutions, and their subjective nature; but they are nonetheless instructive beyond what we have seen so far.

Table 4 is particularly revealing with respect to the relationships between the youths and their families, and in relation to the youths' social functioning. We note that 50% or more among the youths have major difficulties in their relationships with their families: they reject them or are rejected, and the relations at home - including those between the parents themselves - are unstable. These patterns may well reflect a collision between the traditional values and norms of immigrants from Afro-Asian origin, and the youth's attempts to adjust to modern Israeli society.

Note also that conflicts within the family are not compensated for by success in other social contexts. These same youths often find themselves rejected by their own peer groups, or become marginal members of these

Table 4. Selected Background Characteristics (III) - Behavior and Functioning[1]

Attribute	Distribution	
Family's Relation to Youth	Indifferent 8.1%, Rejecting 32.7%,	Unstable 18.1% Total 58.9%
Youth's Relation to Family	Unstable 36.4%, Total 42.0%	Detached 5.6%
Relations at Home (general)	Unstable 54.8%	
Studies	Weak 36.5%,	Mediocre 44.1%
Motivation to Study	None 22.6%,	Mediocre 22.6%
Work	Unmotivated 17.6%,	Mediocre 37.0%
Youth in Group	Passive, Rejected,	Rejects, etc. 33.4%

---

[1] In contrast to Tables 2 and 3, this selection of attributes is based on evaluations by social workers, psychologists, teachers, counsellors, etc. Needless to say, no population parameters are available. Data on these dimensions are relatively sparse, and do not represent the total sample. In fact, some variables (reciprocal relations with family) were available in only less than 50% of the programs - though for more than 50% of the total sample.

groups; and they have neither the necessary motivation nor (given their previous careers) much ability to succeed at school or at work, and to pursue normative careers. In sum, we encounter a general profile of multiple failures in diverse social contexts, of marginality in both nuclear family and peer group, of maladjustment, and of underachievement in the most crucial spheres of life - a profile of disadvantage and distress.

In re-examining these profiles of disattached youths, we now turn to an analysis of selected background characteristics in different rehabilitation frameworks. In doing so, we collapse the 57 institutions and programs into eight categories: Youth Aliyah residential schools, Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs residential schools, Hachsharot in kibbutzim, Youth Protection Agency involuntary institutions and hostels, street groups under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Culture and of Labor and Social Affairs respectively, unique residential centers for the disattached, and the Unit for Girls in Distress. Residential centers for youngsters (Mechinot) and the sample of entirely disattached youths are excluded, as no background data are available here.* These catagorizations are necessitated by the small number of youths absorbed in some of the specific programs. We are proceeding on the assumption that the agencies running these different programs are at least moderately consistent in absorbing youths with generally similar characteristics. In other words, the following data provide some indication as to the selection and self-selection processes operating in the various rehabilitation programs categorized into more global frameworks, and permit us to test the presumed rationality of the referral and admission policies common in the Israeli rehabilitation system.

---

* Except data on delinquency; see Footnote 4 to Table 5.

Table 5. Selected Background Characteristics by Rehabilitation Framework

Framework[1] Attribute	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Sex (% Males)	57.3	88.2	90.9	97.7	0	94.1	86.8	63.7
Father's origin (% Asia-Africa)	82.0	83.3	85.5	N.A.[2]	84.9	77.2	73.7	74.7
Father's education (% 8 yrs. or less)	89.9	82.4	87.0	N.A.	N.A.	88.2	84.2	84.1
Father unemployed (%)	34.1	29.8	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	31.7	30.1	30.9
Family income (low 10%)	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	50.0	66.6	69.9
No. of Siblings (% 7+)	49.2	57.1	50.5	57.1	44.1	34.3	46.4	35.0
% Delinquency in family	13.2	14.9	10.1	N.A.	2.6	N.A.	2.6	1.3
% Illness in family	24.6	30.2	23.1	N.A.	27.6	6.0	10.5	15.6
Youth's residence (% not home/one-parent)[3]	49.3	N.A.	52.5	N.A.	N.A.	47.3	42.1	45.8
Youth rejected by family (%)	N.A.	53.6	49.5	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	54.2
Youth rejecting family (%)	54.6	36.4	49.9	44.1	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	39.3
Youth in group (% negative functioning)	44.7	48.4	N.A.	N.A.	40.4	N.A.	38.1	37.3
Prior rehabilitation (% one program or more)	47.7	30.2	8.5	N.A.	15.3	12.9	2.6	7.6
Prior schooling (% 8 yrs. or less)	50.8	37.1	38.8	31.1	38.8	22.2	37.5	28.6
Current studies (%)	N.A.	100	43.3	19.9	22.6	100	100	100
Current work (%)	N.A.	N.A.	59.1	48.3	52.2	0	0	0
% with criminal records[4]	67.7	66.2	47.9	49.0	13.8	26.7	33.9	35.9
No. of offenses (x)	18.8	7.0	3.2	5.5	0.3	1.1	1.4	1.6
No. of convictions (x)	4.3	1.8	2.1	2.4	1.3	2.1	1.6	2.0

1. Rehabilitation frameworks are listed as follows: (1) Youth Protection Agency (2) Unique Residential Centers (3) Youth Advancement - Education (4) Youth Advancement - Social Affairs (5) Girls in Distress (6) Labor and Social Affairs - residential (7) Youth Aliyah - residential (8) Hachsharot - kibbutzim. No background data (except on delinquency) are available on Preparatory Schools (Mechinot), and on the subsample of entirely disattached youths.
2. Data not available, or insufficient number of cases to compute meaningful summary statistics.
3. Youths in residential centers who return home during vacations etc. are counted as residing with their families.
4. For comparison purposes, we list the pertinent data on delinquency for the remaining two subsamples: Disattached youths (not in any program) - 32.6% with criminal records; no. of offenses $\bar{x} = 2.44$; no. of convictions $\bar{x} = 2.33$. Mechinot: 35.9%, $\bar{x} = 1.58$, and $\bar{x} = 1.95$ respectively.

Unfortunately, certain data with both theoretical and policy import are missing in Table 5 - as they are, of course, also absent in institutional files. We note first that some types of information are completely unavailable in several institutional files - an omission that obviously limits our ability to generalize. Moreover, we were unable to collect any more meaningful data on the youth's family background - e.g., probes into the history of family disfunctions, specific processes involved in the youth's alienation and detachment from his or her family, the extent of parents' and siblings' criminal involvement, etc. We also know comparatively little about the youth's educational and institutional past beyond the most general information, or about the youth's educational achievements, social functioning and disciplinary problems in the studied rehabilitation framework itself. While some institutions had been more exacting in recording such data, we chose not to display this information here, as no comparisons across institutions can be made.* Most importantly perhaps - at least insofar as rehabilitation officials' assertions about the distinctiveness of certain programs are concerned - we know close to nothing about the motivational and personality differences, if any, among youths absorbed in different institutions. We shall return to this point below.

At least one difference among institutions in each of the comparisons in Table 5 is statistically significant; however, given the fact that some 300 such comparisons are involved, (i.e., that isolated significant differences may well be due to chance), and given that most frameworks are represented by populations rather than by samples, it may be most useful to examine these patterns without reference to statistical tests.

---

* Some institutions also lack data on the variables displayed in Table 5; but here at least partial comparisons are possible.

We note first the already commented upon unequal distribution of male and female disattached youths in the sample. With the exception of the Unit for Girls in Distress, males are represented more heavily in all rehabilitation frameworks, even where such an extreme maldistribution would not have been expected on an a priori basis (e.g., Youth Aliyah centers). Interestingly, the most even sex distribution occurs in Youth Protection Agency institutions, despite the well-documented prevalence of delinquency among males. As already noted, girls are often referred to these institutions on the basis of considerations unrelated to the criminal justice system, such as personal and social distress - a practice which may account for the almost equal presence of both sexes.

Other patterns of differentiation among the various frameworks are more difficult to discern. Table 5 is organized so as to maximize our ability to discover trends that may be indicative of differences among the rehabilitation frameworks (as noted, statistical tests of significance are not appropriate here). Thus, we distinguish among four types of background characteristics (general SES attributes; family functioning and the relationship of the youth with his or her family; the youth's own level of social, intellectual and occupational functioning; and delinquency). While global SES variables do not appear to distinguish among the various rehabilitation programs, there is a tendency for youths in one group of frameworks - composed of Youth Protection Agency institutions, unique residential centers and all Youth Advancement units (i.e., columns 1-4 in Table 5) to exhibit somewhat more negative characteristics. This trend is particularly evident with respect to the three variables related to criminal activity, but may also be discerned with respect to the following:

1. Family size (number of siblings);
2. Delinquent patterns in the family; here the differences are quite pronounced, though, as we shall see in Chapter 8, this variable fails to predict the youth's own outcomes (including his or her own criminal activity).
3. Limiting illnesses in the family; the Unit for Girls in Distress breaks the consistency of this pattern, however.
4. Youths in Protection Agency Centers appear to suffer particular disadvantages with respect to low achievements in the formal educational system, and exhibit a pronounced propensity to drop out from other rehabilitation programs as well.
5. Interestingly, it is less clear whether these youths are also most delinquent. While the number of offenses and convictions accumulated by inmates of Youth Protection Agency centers is clearly high, the total number of delinquents (i.e., those who had accumulated at least one record) does not differ from that in the two unique residential institutions.
6. Given the extent of missing data for some of the more interesting variables (e.g., the youths' relations with their families, or their social functioning) it is virtually impossible to make any further assertions substantiating any trend here.
7. It appears generally to be the case that residential institutions which absorb more heterogeneous populations (i.e., not only disattached youths) also attract the least disadvantaged among the

population of dropouts. This is the case particularly with respect to educational and rehabilitation careers (e.g., close to 80% among youths in Vocational Training Center had completed 8 or more years of schooling; less that 8% of Youth Aliyah residents had been in another rehabilitation framework); with respect to the prevalence of delinquency and debilitating illness in the youth's nuclear family; with respect to the youth's living arrangements (though the differences here are less impressive); with respect to his or her functioning within the peer group (no data available for vocational training centers); and with respect to family size (although other differences are noteworthy here). To a lesser extent, a similar pattern obtains for the residential centers in Kibbutzim.

8. The least internally consistent background pattern pertains to participants in the Unit for Girls in Distress. For example, instances of illness in the family and participation in prior rehabilitation programs are relatively numerous, whereas the position of these females with respect to, for example, family size, delinquency in the family and own delinquent patterns, is comparatively advantageous.

It is quite evident that these findings are far from internally consistent, and that any implications that may be drawn from them are equivocal at best. There appear to be at least four trends which emerge from the data displayed in Table 5: (1) There are two clusters of rehabilitation programs (the first and more disadvantaged consisting of Youth Protection Agency and unique residential centers, and of Youth Advancement Units), which are partially differentiated on the basis of family and own functioning, and delinquency. (2) Within this cluster, Youth Protection Agency institutions tend to be most extreme (i.e., youths possess the most negative attributes), particularly with respect to delinquency - as might be expected. (3) Residents in institutions which are not exclusively designed to absorb disattached youths evince a number of advantages relative to other youths - although this pattern is once again inconsistent. And (4) the characteristics of participants in some frameworks (Hachsharot in Kibbutzim, and especially the Unit for Girls in Distress) are too heterogeneous (and at times too much data are missing) to reach any generalizations.

While the findings in Table 5 do, as noted, evince several trends, they do not point to entirely consistent or clearly defined differences among the various rehabilitation frameworks - with the clear exception of criminal behavior, which is to be expected on the basis of the Youth Protection Agency's responsibilities as defined by law. These ambiguities raise serious questions regarding the "rationality" of the referral and absorption mechanisms in the Israeli rehabilitation system for disattached youths. Paradoxically, however, this same ambiguity has considerable analytic advantages for the purposes of the present study. As programs are not confounded with participants' known characteristics and attributes, the impact of these two types of variables on individual outcomes can be estimated separately - as we shall indeed proceed to do in Chapter 8.

This leaves us with the tricky problem of potential unmeasured or unmeasurable characteristics of youths, which may or may not differentiate among programs and institutions. The argument that such characteristics do exist - particularly in the realms of negative motivations (or the absence of positive motivations) vis-a-vis normative social institutions and with respect to ill-defined personality characteristics - is rather common among rehabilitation officials. Presumably, this argument would serve to underline the rationality of the system, as it implies that reality-based decisions regarding the selection of youths into different institutions are made despite appearances to the contrary. However, if this were the case, what are these decisions based on? After all, the objective or otherwise quantifiable information collected by these agencies (which presumably form the basis of decisions regarding admissions) are already part of the data analyzed in this study. Beyond subjective impressions of local counsellors and other staff - which are of dubious validity and reliability - rehabilitation programs have no other data on which to base their decisions. In other words, since the information on youths available to these institutions is in essence equivalent to the data available in this study, there are no evident grounds for the assertion that these institutions maintain a rational selection and admissions policy, or that there is any planned variability in the youths' characteristics between different rehabilitation frameworks. The major clear exception to this rule is to be found, as already noted, in the highly delinquent behavioral patterns of youths in involuntary detention centers. There is little doubt that delinquent behavior is also reflective of ostensibly negative motivational and personality qualities. Thus, inmates of involuntary centers may indeed differ from the disattached population as a whole on such unmeasured characteristics; but these may be accounted for, at least in part, by patent behavioral tendencies which are already part of the present data set (i.e., delinquency). In other words, it appears somewhat supercilious to maintain that the rehabilitation system is able to make rational decisions about the differential referral of youths to rehabilitation institutions and frameworks when officials lack much of the necessary information to make such decisions.

The preceding arguments require an additional rejoinder. The presumed existence of unmeasured or unmeasurable differences among disattached youths in this sample reflects not only on the rationality of decision-making in the rehabilitation system, but on the validity of the current study as well. If such characteristics in fact exist, if they consistently differentiate between youths in different institutions, and if they differentially affect performance and social reintegration as defined here - we would be unable to reach any conclusions about the casual effects of institutions and programs on individual performance. For example, if graduates of a given program were found to evince a superior military service as compared to those enrolled in other frameworks (even after controlling for the efforts of known individual characteristics), it could be argued that these youths were of "higher" (but unmeasured) quality in the first place. On the other hand, if no differences in the performance of youths from various programs were to be found, it could be maintained that some institutions offer a superior rehabilitation program, but that enrolled youths were more "difficult" (again, on unmeasured dimensions) at intake.

The answer to this argument cannot be provided by a theoretical discussion or by the employment of statistical techniques, however sophisticated. The "latent characteristics" claim could be hypothetically valid so long as we are unable to employ a design of strict randomization among treatments (i.e., insticutions and programs) - which is, of course, inconceivable. However, I am convinced that such an argument is less than tenable in the present case, especially considering the statistical controls employed here, and the consistency of findings across different modes of analysis. In any event, it would appear reasonable to put the burden of proof - that such unmeasured characteristics in fact exist, that they differentiate among institutions, and that they have independent effects on rehabilitational outcomes - on those officials who make such claims.

5. INSTITUTIONAL ATTRIBUTES AND PATTERNS*

In this chapter, we shall temporarily switch from one level of analysis to another. In lieu of analyzing the individual youths' background characteristics (as in chapter 4) or performance and behaviors (as we shall continue to do in the remaining chapters), we shall concentrate here on the _institutional_ level of analysis - i.e., on the examination of the various organizational differences among institutions. I should note at the outset that while the patterns uncovered here appear to be consistent and substantively meaningful, it remains to be seen whether they in fact explain rehabilitative success; there are still a number of problems in applying the types of causal analyses that would make such a bridging between institutional attributes and rehabilitation outcomes possible. Moreover, we shall restrict ourselves here to an examination of the 21 residential institutions surveyed in this study; community rehabilitation settings are not subjected to similar analyses in this chapter for the mundane reason that these data have not yet been adequately structured for such analyses.

Recall the methods and major rationale of collecting data on the attributes of rehabilitation institutions. We started with the premise that specific institutional characteristics - be they ecological, demographic, policy-related, programatic, or interactional and processual - may affect rehabilitation outcomes. Moreover, we maintain that any comprehensive application of this research project to institutional change and improvement requires that statements be made about the contribution of specific institutional attributes and processes to the youth's resocialization, rather than about the rehabilitative effect of the institution as a whole; after all, it is more likely that ineffectual institutional patterns will be changed than that an institution be eliminated altogether as a function of social research.

---

* Many of the dimensions relating to the general issues outlined in this chapter are summarized in an article entitled "Organizational patterns in institutions for disattached youth", to appear in _Delinquency and Social Deviance_ (in press; in Hebrew). I will consequently restrict myself here to a relatively brief description of the relevant findings.

The contents of the specific institutional attributes measured in the present study were determined by earlier research (particularly by Moos and his colleagues; see also chapter 2), although some adaptations to the realities of Israeli institutions were deemed necessary. The methods for collecting these data were dictated by timing and budgetary constraints, and consisted of in-depth structured interviews with senior and junior staff and with small samples of participant youths, supplemented by a limited number of observations. Interviewing, though of larger samples than those employed here, also served Moos' research as a primary method.

Rather than examine in detail the numerous dimensions of institutional structure and processes elicited in these interviews, we shall restrict ourselves here to the definition, identification, and delineation of what appears to be a singular theoretical and empirical continuum of institutional conduct. In the absence of a more appropriate defining term, we designate this continuum as anchored at its extreme endpoints by two distinct and opposite orientations: the orientation toward treatment versus the orientation toward maintenance. These concepts may be found in some of the earlier literature on residential institutions - and not only for disadvantaged youth, but also for the mentally ill, the elderly, etc.; and while some of the specific components of this continuum, as elaborated here, go beyond those identified in this literature, these terms do indeed roughly describe the patterns emerging in this study. We note also that the anchors of the continuum of treatment vs. maintenance orientations are in fact to be considered "ideal types", in the sense that they do not exist in pure form among the Israeli institutions surveyed; several institutions do, however, come close to either extremity of the continuum.

The analysis to be presented below is based on 103 intensive interviews with staff (40 with senior members of staff, primarily directors and school principals, and 63 with counsellors, psychologists, and social workers), and 84 interviews with students or inmates corresponding in age and disattachment characteristics to our general sample. For obvious reasons, the content of the interview schedules differed for these three types of population.

A total of 21 residential institutions are included in the following analyses. These may be categorized as follows: heterogeneous residential institutions absorbing both disattached and other populations; these include Youth Aliyah centers, institutions for vocational training, and agricultural schools (7); unique institutions for the rehabilitation of disattached youth (2); kibbutzim (7); and involuntary institutions operated by the Youth Protection Agency (5). These, of course, represent all residential centers surveyed in this study; and these 21 institutions were responsible for the absorption of some 21.6% of the total sample of disattached youths studied here. The average total number of interviews available from each of the 21 institutions for the purpose of the present analyses is approximately 8.

The overall contents of the various interview schedules have already been elaborated in the section on methods and procedures (chapter 3); it may, however, be useful to reemphasize those dimensions that are of particular interest for the analyses below. The order in which these dimensions are discussed is of no particular importance; at this point, we consider the contribution of all these components to the treatment vs. maintenance continuum as equal.

Seven primary and two secondary components of the treatment vs. maintenance orientation continuum emerge from our analysis, as follows:

(1) Maintenance of contact with youths' families (especially with parents), and the frequency and quality of these contacts.

(2) Contacts with and follow-up of graduates, and the frequency, duration, and quality of these contacts.

(3) Procedures and criteria for selecting youths into the institution (not relevant to involuntary centers).

(4) Reasons for youths' dropout and attrition (not relevant to involuntary centers).

(5) Prevalence of counselling and psychological and/or group treatment as part of the institutional program.

(6) The formal or semiformal disciplinary code adopted by the institution; that is, the nature of transgressions punished or punished severely.

(7) Residents' sense of dependency and institutionalism.

The two secondary components of the treatment vs. maintenance continuum are:

(8) The size of the population absorbed by the institution; and

(9) Population heterogeneity, in terms of the proportion of disattached youths absorbed relative to other types of population.

The more "treatment-oriented" institutional pattern is represented by high levels of contact with parents and graduates, by student selection based on needs rather than on achievement, by attrition due to external rather than to institutional difficulties, by high-frequency and high-intensity treatment at the individual and/or group levels, by an emphasis on the enforcement of wider social and legal, rather than of internal and institutional norms, and by residents' heightened sense of dependency. Treatment-oriented institutions are by and large smaller, and absorb homogeneous or almost homogeneous populations of disattached youth. These are labelled "secondary components" as they are unlikely to represent primary policy-decisions regarding the nature of treatment; rather, they are probably the outcome of more extensive and intensive treatment modalities.

Let us now examine these patterns and their empirical representation in greater detail. The distribution of the 21 residential centers along dimensions (1-7) is displayed in Table 6.

Table 6. Distribution of Residential Institutions: Treatment vs. Maintenance Orientations

Dimension	Treatment Oriented	Maintenance Oriented	Mixed Orientation
1. Contact - Parents[1]	17[2]	4	0
2. Graduate Follow-up[3]	7	14	0
3. Selection Criteria[4]	8	5	3
4. Attrition - Causes[4]	8	7	1
5. Treatment Activity[5]	6	5	10
6. Disciplinary Code	10	8	3
7. Dependency	5	10	6

1. Including outreach activities in ten institutions.
2. Number of residential institutions (of 21 total) conforming to pattern.
3. Including outreach activities in two institutions.
4. Not relevant in the involuntary institutions.
5. Regular and constant therapy - in three institutions only.

Contact with parents is maintained in 17 institutions (approx. 81%), usually via parents' visits at regular intervals, telephone contacts and correspondence (though these tend to occur following disciplinary transgressions), and instructions to treatment staff (e.g., social workers) to maintain contact with parents. In two institutions the entire staff is involved in such contacts, and in a third a special person had been designated to deal with "the environment", including parents. In nine institutions (approx. 43%) staff conducted house visits, although these were again usually motivated by specific disciplinary problems. Despite this considerable activity, it appears that in most institutions staff-parent contacts were underutilized, at least insofar as treatment aims are concerned. In other words, parents - even when kept informed - were only rarely involved in the treatment and rehabilitation process itself. Both intensive counselling of parents and the utilization of structured parent-children interactions and dynamics were almost entirely absent.

Follow-up. Here the patterns are considerably more distinct; only seven of the residential institutions (approx. 33%) practice any type of follow-up activity, and in all but three institutions these activities are unsystematic, and do not involve institution-initiated contacts with the graduates' military unit or work place. Systematic follow-up in this context is taken to mean the following activities: contact initiated by the institution at regular intervals, at high levels of the organizational hierarchy, involving multiple channels of communication (letters, telephone, mutual visits), and extending beyond the mere collection of data - i.e., involving treatment, advice, and even aid in obtaining employment or in dealing with everyday problems. As noted, this type of follow-up is practiced by only a small minority of the surveyed institutions.

Selection criteria. While the two above practices (contact with parents, residents) could, in principle, be argued to be determinental to treatment goals (e.g., is it advisable to heavily involve parents, who may have been one of the prime contributors to the disattachment process? Or, does the potential stigmatization of youths not vitiate the advantages of institutional aid?). These concerns, however, are hardly pertinent to the dimensions examined below. The first of these dimensions are the criteria used for the selection and admission of youths.

Only sixteen institutions are pertinent to this analysis, as involuntary centers have no discretion in this matter, and receive referrals by court order, or - and mostly in the case of girls - by community services. Of the remaining institutions, four (some 19%) utilize "preparatory periods", lasting 3 to 14 days, to diagnose those youths most suitable for admission; the criteria underlying this selection tend to be rather vague. The most direct indication of admission practices comes from staff questionnaires which included eleven criteria for selection (e.g., grades, psychological tests or diagnoses, delinquency, etc.), rated on a 4-point scale of importance. As may be seen in Table 6, the 16 institutions again cluster around the two primary orientations, with a few exhibiting a mixed pattern. The treatment orientation is characterized by the following dimensions as the most important criteria for selection: family and community (disadvantaged) background, delinquency (as a contributing factor in admission), lack of other educational or rehabilitation alternatives, informal psychological diagnoses, and informal opinions rendered by the staff (usually during the preparation period). The maintenance orientation, on the other hand, involves the following most salient admission criteria: educational and other achievements, formal tests of ability and psychological well-being, and formally required opinions and recommendations by outside sources.

Note that the latter criteria are by no means less legitimate; it does appear, however, that they represent somewhat less appropriate considerations for admitting or rejecting disattached youths, who are unlikely to do well on either cognitive or psychological tests. We will see below that institutions with a maintenance orientation are also most heterogeneous, admitting disattached youths together with other populations; the achievement-oriented admission criteria may well have been developed for the latter. In any event, as shown in Table 6, eight institutions (50%) conform to the treatment orientation, five (31%) to the maintenance orientation, and the remaining three exhibit a mixed pattern. Other admissions criteria, such as age and physical health, played no role in this distinction.

Causes of attrition. This is a somewhat complex dimension, as the interviewed staff readily admitted that they were not always aware of the youth's reasons for dropping out, that these reasons were often multifarious, and that there is sometimes no clear distinction between youth-initiated dropout and institution-initiated removal; the latter will concern us again below. Nonetheless, even here there do appear to be differently clustered components according to the treatment vs. maintenance orientations.

The treatment orientation is in this case represented by reasons for attrition - at least as attributed by the staff - that concern primarily external causes: problems in the family or with close friends, the attractiveness of the street gang or of the neighborhood in general, and other external temptations. These attributions were found in a total of eight institutions. The opposite or maintenance orientation, again found in eight centers, is reflected in explanations for attrition that pertain to internal events: conflicts with staff or with other students, or a general sense (on the youth's part) of lack of adaptation or of failure. Again, the five involuntary institutions are not included in this analysis. The pattern is admittedly weak in terms of both its distinctiveness and its reliability; yet, it cannot be dismissed easily.

Therapeutic measures are perhaps the most direct exponent of the difference between these two orientations. All institutions ostensibly are involved in treatment activities beyond those directly related to education, vocational training, and recreation. And yet, only in six institutions do we find frequent (once a week or more) intensive consulting, counselling, or therapeutic work with youths by personnel on the premises, and at both the individual and the group levels. Ten additional institutions perform some but not all of these functions (the "mixed" column in Table 6), and in five centers we find no constant or formal treatment activities whatsoever. We cannot but wonder whether residents in these latter institutions managed to "find anyone to talk to", which was in fact one of the more salient complaints voiced by many of the youths we interviewed.

Disciplinary code. This heading includes, in my view, one of the more interesting findings from this part of the study. We included in the staff questionnaires an extensive range of questions about institutional policies regarding youths' transgressions on and off the premises, and about the prevailing codes of discipline, whether formal or informal. Despite the fact that there must be some disagreements on these matters, and that formal and informal procedures undoubtedly at times conflict with one another (as they do in Youth Protection Agency centers, according to the most recent findings of the State Comptroller in his 1984 report on these institutions), we found almost complete consensus among interviewed staff members on these matters.

The issue of central interest here are the type of transgressions punished by the institution, and the differential severity of punishment as a function of the type of transgression; the frequency of punishment and its overall severity per se, are not distinctively related to the treatment vs. maintenance orientations. We distinguish between transgressions pertaining to general social norms (many grounded in laws and regulations), such as dealing in drugs, drug abuse, theft, burglary and robbery, violence and vandalism; as opposed to transgressions related to institution-specific (i.e., tied to internal rules and regulations) norms such as absence without permit, untoward behavior at school or at work, conflicts with members of the staff or, in one case - going down to the beach.

Institutional responses to these transgressions may be scaled on the basis of their severity, ranging from nil (disregard) through internal and temporary sanctions (no vacation, more work), referral to external authorities (the police), removal, or combinations thereof. The major point I wish to make here is that the punishment fits the crime differently in the two types of institutions: treatment-oriented institutions (10) either do not sanction transgressions of internal regulations, or punish them only mildly (individual talks or group discussions), and sanctions do not cumulate (that is, further and similar transgressions are not punished more severely). On the other hand, transgressions of general social norms are sanctioned with the fullest severity, and provide the major instigation for police involvement on the premises, and for removal. In the eight maintenance-oriented institutions we find almost diametrically opposed standards of punishment; for example, drug abuse as well as violence are often disregarded - at least for considerable periods of time, while transgressions defined by purely internal standards and regulations may be punished quite severely - including by removal, and especially if they reveal a recidivist pattern.

One possible, though certainly not exclusive interpretation of these findings is that maintenance-oriented institution are more concerned with upholding the internal status quo, which is based on specific regulations and on conformity to institutional rules. While this behavior is not unusual in conservative organizations, it may well be to the student's detriment, as broader social norms are not emphasized and thus not internalized, so that youths are ill-prepared to cope with them while in residence, and consequently later in the outside world as well. In other words, the insistence on conformity to internal rules at the expense of enforcing general social norms may well slow the rehabilitation process itself, and hurt the youth's future chances of social integration.

Dependency and instituionalism. The final component of the treatment vs. maintenance orientation is derived from inmate questionnaires. We asked youths whether they felt that in the institution they had: property of their own, i.e., which they could use at their own discretion; control over their own time, especially during periods designated as leisure time; "a corner of their own," i.e., some extent of privacy; and a sense that the institution and/or the staff members contributed to their development, aided them, etc. These dimensions are a fairly straightforward exposition of Goffman's (1957) notions of dependency and institutionalism. The components described here are highly intercorrelated, and quite clearly distinguish between the two orientations: in ten (48%) maintenance-oriented institutions we find high levels of dependency and institutionalism, as reflected in youths' replies that they lacked individual property, space, and free time, as well as staff support. In five institutions we find the opposite pattern; and the orientation in the remaining institutions is mixed.

Table 7. Prevalence of Treatment - Orientation in 21 Residential Centers

No. of Treatment-Oriented Components	No. of Residential Centers (of 21)
7	0
6	2
5	6
4	6
3	1
2	2
1	4
0	0

Summary

Table 7 presents the adjusted number of residential centers* that exhibit any of the seven dimensions related to the distinction between the treatment or maintenance orientations, as discussed in this chapter. Note that the extreme points of this continuum have no empirical representation among Israeli institutions, and that the distribution is generally skewed toward a more treatment-oriented pattern. Nonetheless, fully one-third of the surveyed institutions maintain three components or less of this orientation. Note also that, as already mentioned above, these components and their prevalence along the orientation continuum are highly correlated with two additional institutional attributes; size and population homogeneity. Centers with less than 100 inmates and with an absorption rate of more than 75% disattached youths are more likely to be treatment-oriented.

---

* For two of the dimensions - selection and attrition - the appropriate number of institutions for analysis is 16 rather than 21, as involuntary centers are excluded here.

It is less clear what all this may mean. It must be considered that these patterns are identified here on a purely a posteriori basis, and that they were not driven by any advance hypotheses. This immediately implies two potential drawbacks, namely (1) that not all relevant or even most important dimensions have been identified, and (2) that those dimensions that have been identified are not of equal value in predicting rehabilitation (i.e., should perhaps be weighed). Of course, the latter argument would render the distributions displayed in Table 15 practically meaningless for all but the most rudimentary categorization purposes. All this implies that additional statistical work is required, especially as the answer to the second question is basically an empirical one; the impact of these institutional orientations on indices of rehabilitation has yet to be examined. Nonetheless, I would argue that these patterns are interesting in and of themselves, and that - at least at face value - the treatment orientation seems to be more conducive to rehabilitative success.

6. INSTITUTIONAL CORRELATES OF CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Of the total sample, 42.9% or 1355 youths had committed at least one known crime (i.e., had accumulated at least one official police record) at the time data from Police Authority files were collected.* The total number of officially recorded crimes that had been perpetrated by this sample of disattached youths was 12,417, or an average of 3.93 delinquent acts for each youth. The maximal number of crimes attributed to one single youth was 247, although this case is hardly representative. We do note, however, that 69.9% of those involved in delinquent activities (i.e., excluding those without criminal records) had been accused of more than one crime, 55.2% of more than two crimes, and fully 22.7% of more than ten instances of criminal conduct. While these statistics frequently reflect multiple criminal records for a single act (such as stealing a car, driving it without license, etc.), we note that they reflect only _official_ records of juvenile criminal activity; there are good reasons to suspect that the _actual_ crime rate - as it might be elicited via self-reports - would be significantly higher (e.g., Hindelang _et al._, 1981).

As one might expect on the basis of previous research (e.g., Jensen & Eve, 1976; Smith, 1979; Giallombardo, 1982), boys were significantly more delinquent than girls: 82.2% among those with at least one criminal record were males, and only 17.8% females. The mean number of criminal records among boys was 5.22, as opposed to only 0.53 for girls. Thus, a large majority among disattached boys had a record of delinquency, and their criminal involvement was quite substantial. Generally then, disattachment is quite heavily related to delinquent activities, particularly among boys. The direction of causality cannot be established on the basis of the current data; in all likelihood, school dropout increases the youth's propensity to become criminally involved, but participation in crime may also enhance the chances of leaving school - perhaps through the influence of peer groups.

---

* This calculation is based on N=3159, excluding 486 youths for whom no police data could be obtained (see Footnote 4, Table 1).

Interestingly, traditional sociodemographic background variables such as ethnicity, parents' socioeconomic and occupational status, and their level of education were not found to be related to crime rate - perhaps due to the limited variance of these characteristics. Suprisingly, youths' involvement in crime was also found to be unrelated to the existence of delinquents in their nuclear families. Instead, we find that the most prominent predictors of youths' criminal involvement pertain to specific aspects of the youth's relationship with his or her family of origin. Thus, youths whose parents were living together exhibited lower levels of delinquency (27.8%) than youths from single-parent families (72.2%); due to small N's no distinctions based on the reasons for single parenthood - e.g., death, divorce, etc. are made here. Youths living entirely outside the nuclear family's dwelling were even more delinquent. These findings are undoubtedly relevant to our understanding of the social etiology of juvenile delinquency; factors pertaining to the nature and quality of relations with the nuclear family, and particularly the family's integrity, appear to be crucial to the youth's social integration, conformity, and functioning.

A considerable number of the criminal records accumulated by these youths (34%) are ultimately closed by the public prosecutor's office or by the courts; reasons for closure include lack of evidence, lack of public interest, or are left unspecified. Only 18.6% among the accused youths actually stood trial and were either convicted, or - in relatively few cases - adjudged mentally incompetent or retarded. Some cases were convicted but not sanctioned due to considerations of age. The two major remaining categories of dispositions include open files (cases not yet adjudicated - 22%) and acquittals (25.4%). Thus, a significant majority of delinquent youths are ultimately not convicted of any crime, even if they accumulate considerable number of police records. This discrepancy may be due to the leniency of the juvenile courts, or to the tendency of police officers to arrest youths with these particular social characteristics without necessarily garnering sufficient evidence that would stand up in court, or to the propensity to rearrest these same youths once they had accumulated a number of police records (i.e., once they are labelled "delinquents" by the authorities).

Two additional comments are in order here. First, the Israeli law recognizes a distinction between juvenile delinquency (age 13 to 18; earlier records and files on arrests, if any, are erased) and adult crime (age 18 and above). Naturally, most youths in this sample who had been charged with a crime fall into the former category; adult criminal activities mostly pertain to delinquent acts conducted after the youth had already left the rehabilitation institution or program - i.e., during military service or thereafter. The legal distinction between juvenile and adult crime is crucial for the justice system, as it determines where the offender will be adjudicated, and which sanctions are available to the courts. For our purposes, it is necessary to draw a different distinction: between crimes conducted prior to the youth's absorption into the rehabilitation system, and those occurring during his or her tenure and after graduation. This distinction may be correlated with, but not necessarily equivalent to, the legal distinction based on age. We shall return to this issue below.

Second, we may draw an additional distinction regarding the type or severity of the crimes committed by these youth. Israeli law recognizes several hundred separate criminal offenses, which the Police Authorities categorize into over 30 more general "statistical" groupings. Some of these offenses and groupings (e.g., breaking of municipal by-laws, bribery, fraud, economic crimes, etc.) are irrelevant here, as they are never committed by juvenile offenders; others are too inclusive to be of analytic value. Consequently, we constructed the following eleven new categories on an *a posteriori* basis; these will serve us in the analyses to follow: (1) serious crimes such as murder of first and second degree and offenses against state security (1.6%); (2) assault (26.4%); (3) sex offenses (3.3%); (4) robbery and burglary (29.6%); (5) drug-related offenses (4.8%); (6) threats and extortion (1.6%); (7) theft and pick-pocketing (16.5%); (8) vehicle theft and use without permission (3.2%); (9) purchase, storage and sale of stolen goods (1.0%)· (10) offenses against the public order (4.2%); and (11) miscellaneous offenses (a residual category; 7.9%). These categories will be examined in conjunction with the other crime variables of interest.

Table 8 displays five major dimensions of delinquent activity-related variables (officially recorded crime, unadjucated files, closed files, acquittals and convictions) as they are distributed across the nine types of rehabilitation frameworks (Youth Aliyah residential schools; residential centers for vocational training; involuntary Youth Protection Agency residential institutions and hostels; unique residential centers; Youth

Table 8. Selected Delinquency Data in Nine Rehabilitation Frameworks[1]

Framework	Criminal Records		Not Adjudicated[2]		Closed Files[3]		Acquittals		Convictions[4]	
	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%	$\bar{x}$	%
Youth Aliyah	1.41	33.9	2.76	16.8	2.26	46.4	1.80	28.0	1.55	8.8
Vocational Training	1.11	26.7	2.25	17.4	2.11	39.1	1.23	28.3	2.14	15.2
Youth Protection	18.84	67.7	4.50	22.2	5.39	27.5	3.23	25.1	4.34	25.3
Unique Institutions	6.95	66.2	2.17	19.6	3.14	30.7	2.55	30.7	1.82	19.0
Advancement (Educ.)	3.22	47.9	3.58	21.3	2.51	35.0	1.93	25.6	2.14	18.2
Advancement (Soc.Affairs)	5.54	49.0	3.14	22.8	4.88	29.7	2.29	27.1	2.35	20.5
Girls in Distress	0.32	13.8	2.05	24.7	1.53	36.7	1.14	17.7	1.27	20.9
Preparatory Schools	1.58	35.9	2.36	26.6	1.87	41.1	1.81	23.4	1.95	8.9
Disattached	2.44	32.6	2.37	22.9	2.84	36.2	2.01	18.3	2.33	18.3

1. First entry is mean number of records, unadjudicated cases, etc.; second entry is percent youths in each framework falling into these respective categories.
2. "Open" files not yet processed or prosecuted.
3. File closures may be due to lack of evidence, lack of public interest, unspecified decisions by the public prosecutor, and other miscellaneous reasons.
4. This category collapsed convictions followed by punishment with the following additional verdicts (all relatively infrequent): mental illness or retardation, delay of punishment, and convictions without punishment. In other words, in all these cases, youths had been found guilty, but had not received punishment due to either extenuating circumstances or lack of legal responsibility.

Advancement Units run under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs respectively; the Unit for Girls in Distress; Preparatory Schools, and disattached youths).*

The findings displayed in Table 8 are of considerable interest not because they speak directly to the issue of rehabilitation or program effectiveness, but because they reflect at least part of the selection mechanisms which prevail within the rehabilitation system for disattached youths. In other words, Table 8 pertains to the question whether the various institutions and programs are in fact as distinct in the delinquent background of participants as is often argued.** We have already seen at the beginning of this chapter that the majority of males (though only 17.7% among the disattached females) had been criminally involved. Consequently, we would expect some individual level of patent delinquent activities in most if not all the programs studied. We would also expect, however, that this level be significantly above average in specific institutions - most particularly in these associated with the Youth Protection Agency, which receives most of its inmates from the juvenile courts.

---

* The total number of cases in some institutions and programs is too small to yield meaningful statistical comparisons. Consequently, the above ninefold categorization of rehabilitation frameworks is utilized in most of the analyses below. As in any type of generalization, this collapsing technique causes a certain loss of information; in some cases, the within-category variation may even be too substantial to justify this technique. The interested reader is referred to the Hebrew version of this report, which contains appended tables with more detailed specifications of institutions and programs, and pertinent statistics regarding crime rates (as well as indicators of military performance) among participants.

** Note that the data in Table 8 and the analyses to follow combine delinquent acts perpetrated before, during and after residence or participation in the program. We shall address this important analytic distinction below.

In light of these considerations, the data in Table 8 produce a number of surprises. When we examine the total number of criminal records, we find that youths in Youth Protection Agency institutions and hostels do not differ from those absorbed in the two unique residential centers; and they differ only marginally from males treated in community programs (47.9% and 49.0% for the two Youth Advancement Units respectively; the Unit for Girls in Distress is not comparable, as it involves a population which is less delinquent anyhow). While it is undoubtedly true that youths in Protection Agency institutions accumulate more records per individual on the average (18.84) it is also noteworthy that the relative differences between them and other youths diminish significantly when we examine the number of convictions. The total variability of frameworks is more restricted, with all but two (Youth Aliyah Centers and the Unit for Girls in Distress) absorbing youths with substantively equivalent conviction rates. We note also that there are only few appreciable differences among frameworks in the number of unadjudicated criminal records accumulated by youths. Some of these will undoubtedly be turned into convictions; but assuming that the rate of future convictions will not vary among youths in different institutions and programs, the ultimate dispositions of these records will hardly change the overall picture obtained here. We cannot but conclude, then, that the empirical distribution of criminally involved youths is less skewed than might have been expected. Clearly, there are institutions and programs other than those based on involuntary confinement which bear a significant burden of delinquent participants. In other words, these findings on the dispersion of delinquent youths among rehabilitation frameworks once again produce a less than unequivocal picture, so that the question whether the likelihood that

Table 9. Type/Severity of Offense in Nine Rehabilition Frameworks[1]

Framework	$\bar{x}$	A[2](%)	B (%)	C (%)	D (%)	E (%)	F (%)	G (%)	H (%)	I (%)	J (%)	K (%)
Youth Aliyah	5.54	0	17.3	3.7	33.3	6.2	1.2	16.0	3.7	2.5	3.7	12.3
Vocational Training	5.56	3.7	22.2	3.7	25.9	0	0	22.2	0	0	7.4	14.4
Youth Protection	3.78	3.4	45.3	3.4	25.0	6.1	0	10.1	0	0	1.4	5.4
Unique Institutions	4.39	4.1	19.0	3.4	52.4	1.4	2.0	9.5	0.7	1.4	2.0	4.1
Advancement (Educ.)	4.64	1.7	26.8	4.5	32.5	6.2	0.8	13.0	5.1	1.1	2.5	5.6
Advancement (Soc.Affairs)	4.34	0.8	32.5	4.8	35.7	1.6	0	13.5	3.2	1.6	0.8	5.6
Girls in Distress	6.94	0	14.2	0	10.6	5.3	6.2	29.2	1.8	1.8	15.6	15.0
Preparatory Schools	5.17	0.7	21.7	2.9	28.3	4.3	1.4	27.5	3.6	0	4.3	5.1
Disattached	5.58	0.5	26.6	2.3	19.2	6.1	2.8	18.2	4.7	0.5	6.1	13.1

1. First number is mean index of severity (1-11); other entries are percent youths in each framework implicated in these offenses.
2. A - Severe crime (murder etc.); B - Assault; C - Sex offenses; D - Robbery and burglary;
E - Drug-related offenses; F - Threats and extortion; G - Theft and pickpocketing;
H - Vehicle theft and use without permission; I - Purchase, storage and sale of stolen goods;
J - Offenses against the public order; K - Other.
These are scaled (1-11), the lowest digit representing the most severe offense in the means presented in column 1, or the earlier letters (A, B, etc.) of the alphabet in the remaining columns.

differences in program effectiveness are uniquely attributable to the differential absorption of more "hard-core" or "difficult to change" populations remains open.

Let us examine these delinquent activities from a somewhat different perspective. Obviously, not all offenses committed by these youths are, or should be considered as equally severe. We shall now draw a distinction reflecting the severity of the offense, based on the eleven categories as described earlier. The differences in crime severity among the nine types of rehabilitation frameworks are presented in Table 9.

First, it is evident that disattached youths are more heavily involved in some types of criminal activities than in others. These differences are particularly salient, as one might expect, with respect to expressions of violence (assaults), and most crimes with pecuniary motives (robbery, burglary, petty theft, and pickpocketing). On the other hand, we find surprisingly little evidence for other categories of crime presumably prevalent in this age group, and particularly vehicle theft and drug abuse. In general, violent assault accounts for some 26.4% of all crimes committed by these youth, whereas all pecuniary crimes account for 46.1%; in contrast, drug-related offenses represent only 4.8% of all crimes committed, and vehicle theft 3.2%. All other crime categories except sex offenses (3.3%), offenses against the public order (4.2%), and the residual category of miscellaneous offenses (7.9%) are much more marginal.

There is also only partial evidence to suggest the claim that inmates of involuntary Youth Protection centers are engaged in substantively more severe crimes than others. If we accept the present definition of severity as decreasing when we move from the left to the right-hand side of Table 9, we find that the most serious crimes (column A) as well as sex and drug-related offenses are almost equally distributed among three or more rehabilitation frameworks, with the most substantial framework-specific probabilities of severe offenses not necessarily occurring in Youth Protection centers (see, for example, the somewhat higher propensity of males in community frameworks to commit sexual offenses). One major exception is violent crimes (assault), which are most evident among youths in involuntary centers. On the other hand, it appears that youths who commit pecuniary crimes are actually less likely to be sent to involuntary institutions. More serious offenders turn up in one of the two unique residential institutions, in street groups, and - surprisingly - in Youth Aliyah centers, whereas those engaged in petty theft are enrolled in preparatory schools and in vocational training centers. Note also that females in the Unit for Girls in Distress exhibit a somewhat unique pattern, being arrested primarily for petty theft and pickpocketing (29.2%). The number of known sexual (e.g., prostitution) offenses and acts of truancy, on the other hand, is virtually nil in this population.

In general, we may again interpret these findings as suggesting that while there is considerable variance among youths in different rehabilitation frameworks and programs as far as both the extent and the severity of criminal involvement are concerned, these variations are hardly internally consistent. The notion that there is a logical progression in the rehabilitation system, whereby youths are successively referred to more and more "delinquent-oriented", negatively homogeneous, or even closed and involuntary institutions, thus seems to gain little credence and support. Incidentally, even the single indicator of criminal involvement that almost by definition should distinguish between different rehabilitation frameworks (and especially between voluntary and involuntary programs) - namely, data on convictions - does not change this overall picture substantially. For example, while most inmates of Youth Protection centers have accumulated at least one conviction (77.2%, as opposed to, for example, 46% in Social Affairs street groups, and 43.5% among the residents in unique institutions - cf. Table 10), other juveniles found guilty by the courts but released from traditional punishment (e.g., due to retardation, mental illness, or to other extenuating circumstances) are in fact least likely to be committed to involuntary centers. The non-referral of retarded or mentally ill youths to Youth Protection Agency centers conforms to the Agency's explicit mandate; nonetheless, it evidently puts an additional burden on other programs, which are themselves not well-equipped to treat such youths.

Table 10. Distribution of Severity of Criminal Case Disposition (or Sentence) as a Function of Rehabilitation Framework[1]

Framework[2]	A	B	C	D	E
Youth Aliyah	13.6	32.1	14.8	39.5	0
Vocational Training	25.9	29.6	14.4	29.6	0
Youth Protection	77.2	12.1	4.7	5.4	0.7
Unique Institutions	43.5	38.1	7.5	8.2	2.7
Advancement (Educ.)	36.4	28.5	12.7	20.3	2.0
Advancement (Soc. Affairs	46.0	29.4	8.7	13.5	2.4
Girls in Distress	26.5	17.7	20.4	32.7	2.7
Preparatory Schools	13.8	31.9	22.5	29.7	2.2
Disattached	31.3	18.2	19.2	28.0	3.3

1. Percent in category.
2. A - Convictions accompanied by punishment; B - Convictions without punishment (mental illness, retardation, extenuating circumstances); C - Open, not yet adjudicated files; D - Closures (insufficient evidence, lack of public interest, etc.); E - Acquittals.

The complete distribution of data on court dispositions is presented in Table 10. It is crucial to note again that not one single rehabilitation framework investigated here is organizationally or therapeutically equipped to handle these special populations suffering from mental illness or retardation, so that delinquent youth with mental or cognitive problems diagnosed by professionals or so labelled by the juvenile courts, should not be enrolled in _any_ of these institutions. Nonetheless, and in order to restore some semblance of rationality to the rehabilitation system, we should emphasize that inmates in Youth Protection involuntary centers had in fact received the most serious sentences: if we scale the verdicts displayed in Table 8 on the basis of severity (1 - conviction to 5 - acquittal) we find that inmates of Youth Protection centers had been significantly more likely to be convicted and punished ($\bar{x} = 1.63$)* - as, in fact, would be expected.

We now turn to the final and most crucial analyses in this chapter. Up to this point, we have examined the youths' overall propensity to engage in (officially recorded) delinquent activities, the number of convictions, and the severity of offenses perpetrated. All these measures confound the criminal history of these youths prior to their participation in the rehabilitation programs examined with their inclination to commit crimes while in residence (or while participating) and after graduation. This distinction is crucial insofar as the former may be considered selection criteria which distinguish among programs; the latter must be regarded, at least in part, as an outcome, or as a measure of rehabilitation effectiveness. The status of criminal activities while in residence is not entirely clear, as we cannot determine the basis of either theoretical knowledge or empirical data how long a moratorium would be required before the level of criminal activity might be affected by treatment.

---

* The relevant means for the other frameworks are as follows: unique institutions - 2.45; Youth Advancement (Social Affairs) - 2.51; Youth Advancement (Education) - 2.86; Vocational Training and Disattached Youth - 3.22 each; Girls in Distress - 3.41; Preparatory Schools - 3.61; and Youth Aliyah - 3.67. The overall mean of this variable is $\bar{x}=2.88$. Needless to say, these statistics are only as meaningful as the constructed scale - which is inherently problematic as long as the ultimate disposition of open files cannot be established.

It is clear, however, that inmates of involuntary Youth Protection Agency institutions are at a severe disadvantage with respect to this intermediate measure. These institutions are required by law to report to the Police Authorities any violation by inmates while they are in residence. Some of these violations, especially minor ones such as petty theft, drug abuse, minor violence and vandalism, etc., are unlikely to be reported by other residential centers, and altogether unlikely to be discovered by most community programs. Moreover, inmates in involuntary institutions may be - and often are - charged with the unique offense of escaping, which further increases their recorded level of criminal activity. Nonetheless, some more serious offenses, such as more extreme violence and certain types of sexual abuse, may well be more prevalent (i.e., not merely reported more frequently) in involuntary institutions, due to the disadvantageous conditions that prevail there.

Unfortunately, the distinctions among delinquency before, during, and subsequent to program participation turn out to be operationally problematic. We encountered a number of cases for which we lacked basic relevant data, such as the date of admission to the program, the date of graduation, or even both. Had we deleted these cases from the analysis, before-after analysis of delinquency would have included a considerably reduced number of cases.

Consequently, we opted to utilize the most efficient technique for handling missing data in this situation, namely the substitution of average dates of admission and graduation. Generally speaking, when dates of admission were unknown, we calculated the onset of institutional stay and its completion by either using the date of the military draft as a baseline and substituting mean entry and exit dates for each specific institution, or - when the youth had not yet been drafted or had been discharged from service - by relying on the youth's date of birth and proceding forward to estimate the program's mean dates of entry and exit, and substituting these for missing data. This procedure unavoidably creates some restriction of range and variance in these dates. Moreover, it cannot be applied to youths in preparatory schools (for whom birth dates were often unavailable, and for whom those dates do not necessarily predict points of entry and exit in any case), and for entirely disattached youths (for whom admission and graduation dates are by definition irrelevant). The substitution procedure could also not be applied to any youth for whom neither birth nor military induction dates were available. Thus, some missing cases remain.

Since, as already noted above, it is not possible to make an unequivocal judgment as to when rates of delinquency while in residence or in the program reflect a continuation of earlier patterns and when they reflect treatment effects, we opted to combine these with post-program delinquency rates to denote program outcomes. This is clearly an artificial decision (as any other would have been), and, as also already noted, it probably prejudices our findings with respect to inmates of involuntary institutions. Moreover, the analysis presented below represents gross differences among programs and institutions, without considering the possibility that the populations

Table 11. Delinquent Activity (Number of Criminal Records) Prior, During and After Program Participation - As a Function of Rehabilitation Framework[1]

Framework	Before[2,3]		During/After		After/Before Ratio
Youth Aliyah	3.88	(64)	2.21	(39)	.57
Vocational Training	3.85	(20)	3.0	(11)	.78
Youth Protection	21.44	(121)	11.90	(141)	.56
Unique Institutions	9.17	(125)	4.17	(107)	.45
Advancement (Educ.)	4.99	(243)	4.88	(252)	.98
Advancement (Soc.Affairs)	10.36	(113)	4.42	(64)	.43
Girls in Distress	1.73	(62)	1.62	(74)	.94

1. Not including Preparatory Schools and entirely disattached youth.
2. See text for calculation of before, during and after periods.
3. Mean number of official police records per period and per rehabilitation framework. N in parentheses. Statistics pertain to delinquents only.

absorbed in these programs may differ on a priori grounds (i.e., selection). This issue will be taken up again in chapter 8. Finally, we shall examine here only data regarding the number of criminal records, as additional measures (number of trials, convictions, acquittals, severity of offense and sentence, etc.) do not add any significant information.

Table 11 presents the analyses relevant to the distinction between before-program versus during and post (combined)-program officially recorded rates of delinquency. The columns most pertinent to our present purposes are the first (pre-program delinquency rates) and the last - which represents the program-specific likelihood of recidivism relative to the pre-program rate of delinquency. It should be noted, however, that these ratios should be thought of as relative rather than as absolute values, as the pre-program period covered is by definition longer than the post-program period. Thus, for example, a post/pre ratio approaching 0.5 indicates a low rate of recidivism relative to other programs; it does not necessarily imply that youths in this program are less likely to commit criminal offenses after than before participation; and, given enough time, the ratio may in fact have increased (indicating higher recidivism).*

Turning first to the left-side column of Table 11, we find that the pre-program delinquency rates are a precise replication, in relative proportions if not in absolute magnitudes, of the overall rates examined above (see Table 8). That is, youths absorbed in involuntary centers had accumulated by far the most criminal records, followed by the Ministry of Social Affairs Youth Advancement Units by and the two unique institutions, the other (Education) advancement units, the two heterogeneous types of residential institutions (Youth Aliyah and Vocational Training), and lastly the Unit for Girls in Distress. As mentioned, Preparatory Schools and the subsample of entirely disattached youths are not amenable to this before/after distinction. This rank-order, we should emphasize again, reflects differential selection processes in these programs - with the exception of females, who are less likely to commit crimes in any case.

The after/before ratio incidence of delinquent activities, however, reveals a different picture. Both participants in the Unit for Girls in Distress (who had the lowest pre-program crime rate) and in the Education Youth Advancement Unit (who occupied middle ground) were very likely to recidivate. On the other hand, we find a reduction of around 100% in crime rates in three programs which had absorbed the most delinquent youths: Social Affairs Youth Advancement Units, the unique residential institutions, and the involuntary centers of the Youth Protection Agency.

---

* This problem is labelled "censoring". Given certain conditions, future recidivism rates can in fact be estimated and extrapolated from the existing data. Unfortunately, these conditions do not pertain here.

These patterns leave some grounds to suspect that at least part of this relative reduction in post-program delinquency rates is due to an artifactual regression to the mean; this, however, is unlikely to account for the magnitude of this trend. The differences are also not explicable by potential confounding factors such as maturation, which are equally valid for all members of the sample; maturation would in any case be expected to increase delinquency rather than to decrease it, at least in this age group (see, e.g., Hindelag, Hirschi & Weiss, 1981; Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972). We also note again that at least with respect to involuntary centers, the relative reduction in delinquent activities might be even greater than shown here, as any crimes perpetrated while in residence were likely to be accompanied by an official criminal record. It is also noteworthy, in this context, that the after/before ratios of the number of criminal records do not coincide with the ratios reflecting the number of youths involved in criminal activities. With respect to the latter, we find an increase not only in the Unit for Girls in Distress (the ratio is 1.19), but also in the Youth Protection involuntary centers (1.16) - whereas the relative rate of delinquents in all but one of the other frameworks (Advancement Education - 1.04) decreased.

In other words, if we combine the findings on after/before ratios of criminal records and criminally involved youths, the following pattern emerges: a considerable reduction in both measures for some frameworks - particularly the unique institutions and the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs Advancement Units; a pattern of increased delinquency (especially in the number of perpetrators) in the Unit for Girls in Distress; and an inconsistent pattern among youths in involuntary centers, where the number of criminally involved juveniles (but not the total number of records) increases considerably. The latter inconsistency may well be due to the abovementioned propensity to open criminal records for each and every transgression in these centers. It should be noted, however, that all the analyses presented here are of the first order, in that they do not concomitantly account for between-program differences in youths' individual background characteristics. We shall return to this issue in chapter 8 below.

7. INSTITUTIONAL CORRELATES OF MILITARY SERVICE

Overview

In this chapter we shall discuss a series of univariate analyses with the aim of examining how graduates of the different rehabilitation frameworks fare in the course of their military service; more detailed impact analyses are presented in chapter 8.

The present chapter will be divided into two parts. First, we will report institutional differences in "quality data" regarding graduates' cognitive skills, learning deficiencies and motivations - all collected by the IDF at first intake. These test scores serve the military in decisions regarding recruitment and placement, as will be elaborated below. While differences in these quality variables are not attributable only to institutional effects - as they are also a function of pre-institutional background characteristics and processes - it is nonetheless telling that here we find marked differences among the graduates of different institutional frameworks; recall that, in contrast, in chapter 4 we had displayed data suggesting that youths in the various institutional frameworks differed only marginally with respect to background characteristics at the time of absorption.

The second part of this chapter consists of a series of analyses on various indices of actual military performance: whether the youth was recruited at all, where (s)he was placed, courses completed, ranks attained, the frequency and type of disciplinary problems, the type of and reasons for discharge, etc.

Quality intake data

The IDF maintains a fairly elaborate system of tests, interviews and selection at intake, which determines whether a potential recruit will be drafted, and where he or she will be placed. The structure of these instruments and their relative weight in decision making vary somewhat between males and females and over time, although no substantive changes were introduced throughout the research period.

Many of the details on specific testing and selection procedures are highly restricted, and hence not publishable; nonetheless, a few general comments may be conducive. The IDF employs three general sets of considerations for decision-making about potential recruits. The first consists of a medical profile based on extensive physical examinations, as well as a diagnosis of mental health and "adjustment problems" - the latter being derived primarily from patterns of delinquent activities.* Below a certain level of medical profile, youths are discharged; in the middle range they are restricted to service units and jobs; in the upper range they are considered potential for combat units.** Given the input of the adjustment clause into the overall profile, the distribution of scores in the present sample is undoubtedly different from that in the general population, and average profile scores are by and large depressed.

---

* Adjustment clauses are still at an experimental stage, and have in fact been revised during 1985. These scores do, however, affect the recruit's overall medical profile, and thus his or her military career. Recently the IDF also introducted "delinquency scores" as one important determinant of recruitment.

** This is true primarily for males; female soldiers are rarely recruited into combat units.

The second consideration for recruitment and selection is a general score labeled "ability groupings", which itself consists of four unequally weighted components: years of formal education, knowledge of the Hebrew language, cognitive skills, and motivation to serve (boys only). Again, these scores are negatively skewed in this sample compared to the general population, as disattached youths are likely to suffer deficiencies on all these four dimensions. Again, decisions based on these scores may call for rejection from service, referral to special enrichment and/or service units, or potentially open recruitment to combat or special units. Ability groupings also serve as an important basis for subsequent admission to officer and other command courses.

The third group of considerations encompasses a number of special reasons for non-recruitment or grounds for a shortened military service, such as religious observance (primarily girls), higher studies, marriage and pregnancy, severe family or personal problems, frequent delinquency and recidivism, etc. Needless to say, there is also a small contingent of youth who cannot be contacted at all by the IDF; these are usually either emigrants, or youths who have dropped out of the normative social structure altogether.

Medical profiles. Let us now examine the overall distribution of and institutional differences in some of these intake variables; we commence with the medical profile. Generally, profiles vary between 21 (dictating non-recruitment; 10.1% in our sample) and 97 (maximal - 46.8%); the overall distribution was positively skewed, with some 64% above the range permitting service in combat or front units. We note, however, that no profile data could be ascertained for 20.2% of the sample; while the majority of these youths was not drafted on a priori grounds, even before medical examinations were conducted, the absence of profile data for others is not easily explicable. In 19.2% of the cases, recruits' medical profiles were reduced due to a diagnosed mental health problem; the "adjustment (i.e., delinquency) clause", on the other hand, could not be examined, because it was instituted only while the study was already in progress. Changes (mostly reductions) in medical profile during service, initiated by the IDF or by the soldier, occurred in fully 48.3% of the cases; consequently, 57 soldiers were discharged due to medical problems in the course of their service, and the percent of combat-ready soldiers decreased from 64% to 54% due to this downgrading of medical profiles.

The medical condition of youths absorbed by different rehabilitation frameworks differed considerably.* Youths from Youth Aliyah residential centers and females absorbed by the Unit for Girls in Distress, scored highest (approximately 85 on the average); graduates of vocational training centers, youngsters in Mechinot residential centers, and entirely disattached youths scored in the low 80's; and in the two unique residential institutions, in the Youth Protection Agency involuntary centers, and in all community groups, profiles ranged in the mid-70's. There is no immediately evident explanation for either of these differences in medical profiles, although it does appear as though frameworks absorbing youths with "higher quality" characteristics (cf. Table 5) also score higher on medical profiles. The same holds true for medical profiles obtained during recruits' military service: thus, while average profiles during service are some points 7 lower ($\bar{x} = 73.51$, as compared to $\bar{x}$ = 80.87), the pattern of differences among institutions and programs (see above) remains precisely the same. Virtually all youths who experience change in their medical profiles during service incure a reduction (all but 2.8%), and graduates of some frameworks are more likely to do so than others - such as the Girls in Distress Unit (69.3%), Youth Aliyah institutions (64.1%), vocational training residential centers (61.2%), and entirely disattached youths (60.4%).

---

* All framework-specific differences in quality intake data cited in this section are significant at $p < .001$. For brevity's sake, information on specific means and on F ratios has been deleted from the text.

From the IDF's point of view, it may be noteworthy that while the number of recruits from among disattached youths who change medical profiles while in service is substantial (almost 50%), the actual average extent of change is negligible (approximately 7 pts.), and would in most cases not alter the type of service required of the recruit. In other words, unless many of these youths are initially misdiagnosed (e.g., viewed mistakenly as maligners, etc.), they appear to put an unnecessary burden on the military medical and diagnostic system - which, after all, must rediagnose almost half of these recruits after they commence their military service. If, however, the profile reductions are real (i.e., reflect actual changes in medical condition) though insubstantial, one must question the initial (intake) diagnoses; it is, after all, unlikely that almost half of these youths experience a change in physical well-being while in service.

How are the differences among rehabilitation programs in medical profiles to be explained? It seems unrealistic to assume that youths in the studied frameworks in fact differed at intake in physical health; but differences in maladjustment or in mental health may account for these patterns. The former were instituted only while the study was already in progress; but for the latter (mental health clause) we were able to obtain a general indication (yes/no). Indeed, the distribution of these binary indications corresponds almost precisely to the differences in medical profile; the mental health clause was most prevalent among youths from community street groups, the two unique institutions, and the Youth Protection Agency centers (27%-38%).

This last finding elucidates, at least in part, one major source of the differences in medical profiles among graduates of different programs. Evidently, the IDF diagnosed relatively many youths from the above-mentioned institutions and programs as sufficiently disturbed mentally and/or behaviorally to warrant a real reduction in medical profiles. We do not have enough information on the diagnostic procedures used to determine whether these judgments are in fact accurate.* The implication is, however, that diagnoses of mental and behavioral disturbance may severely impair the youth's medical profile on other than physical grounds, and consequently determine the type of service he or she embarks on, and at times even the very preparedness of the army to recruit the youth. As already noted, medical profile reductions based on the mental health clause correspond by and large to the distribution of other background characteristics among rehabilitation frameworks, s detailed in Table 5.

Ability groupings. Ability groupings, which are composed of four elements (education, language skills, cognitive skills, and motivation) are a main criterion for recruitment and placement. They are constructed as a continuous though not parametric variable (range 41 to 56); its precise distribution and other attributes constitute restricted information. Table 12 presents the comparative distributions of ability groupings in our sample and

---

* Which would imply additional qualitative differences among youths absorbed in different programs.

Table 12. "Ability Groupings" Among Disattached Youths and in the General Population

Ability Groupings (scores)	Disattached Youth Sample (N=2833)[1] (percent)	General Population (Males, Females Combined) (percent)
41 - 42	2.7	0.1
43 - 46	66.1	17.5
47 - 50	25.4	24.5
51 - 53	4.6	31.4
54 - 56	1.2	26.6

1. Scores are not available for the remaining part of the sample.

in the general population. The lowest category of ability groupings has been recruited by the IDF only during the past few years, after the introduction of more "socially-oriented" policies for induction, service, and recruits' advancement while in service.

The fact that the disattached sample differs significantly from the general population recruited into the IDF, especially at the upper and lower ends of the scale, requires little elaboration or explanation. The differences between these two distributions are reflected in all four components of the score of ability groupings. For example, only 0.4% of the population scores in the lowest range of the language ability scale (0-3 on a 10-point scale; vs. 1.5% in the disattached sample); the upper range (8-9) is reached by 80.5% vs. 25.1% respectively. On cognitive tests, 6.9% vs. 35.8% score in the lower range, and 24% vs. 1.4% in the upper range. Motivational test scores are similarly distributed: lower range 22.2% vs. 74%, and upper range 6% vs. 0.6%.

Despite these restrictions of range, graduates of different rehabilitation frameworks differ significantly on all four components of quality tests. Rather than belabor this point, let us examine the program-specific differences on the summary scale of these scores, i.e., among the average ability grouping scores (overall $\bar{x}$ - 45.66). Here, we find three general categories with significantly divergent means: Youth Aliyah and Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs residential schools, as well as unabsorbed disattached youths ($\bar{x} > 46$); residential schools for younger children, the Unit for Girls in Distress, and involuntary institutions ($\bar{x} > 45$); and unique residential institutions, as well as all community frameworks for males (street groups: $\bar{x} > 44$). This order corresponds roughly to the differential distribution of selected background characteristics as analyzed in Table 5.

We should add that these differences in the summed ability groupings score virtually mirror the differences in its four individual components. For example, youths from unique residential institutions and from street groups score lowest on all four component scales (education, language skills, cognitive skills and motivation), as well as on the overall ability groupings score. Youth Aliyah and Ministry of Labor residential schools and entirely disattached youths, on the other hand, receive the highest scores.* Evidently, youths in some frameworks may indeed be less developed, skilled and motivated than others. Note, however, that the IDF intake data cannot reveal whether these differences were already present before the youth was absorbed by the program, whether the rehabilitation process itself generated them, or both.

---

* The motivational tests, which concentrate on the youth's readiness to serve in the army and are thus content-specific, are not administered to females, however.

Quality of service

Recruitment. Of the 3645 disattached youths studied, 61.3% were recruited by the IDF. This is well below the general population norm, which approaches 100% for males, and is somewhat lower for females. The male/female recruitment differences are quite extreme in this sample: 70.8% of all disattached males versus 46.7% among the females had been drafted. The most prominent causes of rejection were as follows (percentages pertain to those rejected only): five youths were deceased; nine studied in a religious institution of higher learning; 34.4% were considered unsuitable due to low scores on IDF quality tests (see above); 13.5% were rejected for medical reasons, and a similar percentage on the basis of their delinquent records; 21.7% of the potential female recruits were discharged as they had married, and 19.4% of the same population were not drafted due to their religious observances; 2.9% (males and females) were discharged for unspecified reasons, and the remaining 1.9% could not be traced. Finally, three soldiers received special dispensations and served for periods of one to four months only.

The differences in recruitment among the various rehabilitation frameworks were highly pronounced ($x^2(8) = 237.17$, $p < .001$). The highest recruitment rates were established by youths from the voluntary institutional centers (Youth Aliyah - 80.3%; centers for younger children - 74.2%; Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs institutions - 71.3%; and unique residential centers - 70.7%). The lowest recruitment rates pertain to involuntary Youth Protection institutions (28.6%) and to the Unit for Girls in Distress (51.2%); however, these latter percentages reflect the combined negative effects of delinquency and sex on the probability of recruitment, which have yet to be separated. The middle ground of recruitment rates, ranging from 57% to 69%, is occupied by community frameworks and by disattached youths who had not been reabsorbed. In other words, residential frameworks, unless based on involuntary admission, generally do best in inducting their graduates into the IDF; community frameworks, on the other hand, appear to have no impact on recruitment when compared to youths who had never been reabsorbed. However, the findings regarding the two frameworks at the lower end of the recruitment rate distribution are more difficult to interpret. The Unit for Girls in Distress is the only program examined in this study that absorbs exclusively females - who, as noted above, have a lower rate of military induction than males in the general population as well. An adequate test of the recruitment rates in this program would require a comparison to females in all other relevant rehabilitation programs (i.e., where a substantial number of females are absorbed); and such a comparison does not yield any significant differences. In other words, the low recruitment rate among the members of this unit is probably an artifact contingent upon the low induction rate of females in general.

The findings regarding the involuntary Youth Protection Agency institutions are more difficult to disentangle. As already noted, the IDF now uses a separate score of delinquent activities as part of its draft considerations. This score was not yet in use when this study was conducted, but criminal involvement was weighted as one of the determining factors in the recruitment process nonetheless - as part of the mental health diagnosis (on which we have only binary data), and perhaps in other ways. Moreover, it is likely that the IDF considered the youth's institutional history as a major factor regarding recruitment decisions; residence in an involuntary institution certainly would not be to his or her advantage.

This analysis has a number of implications. If, indeed, the known and high level of delinquency among youths in involuntary institutions accounts for their relatively low recruitment rate, we should be able to isolate the "pure effect" of Youth Protection Agency institutions on recruitment rates by statistically controlling for the youths' level of delinquency (see chapter 8). On the other hand, if the mere residence in such institutions reduces the youth's probability of being recruited (beyond the effect of delinquency levels), the army is in effect stigmatizing these youths, and their low recruitment rate would be substantively meaningless in estimating rehabilitation effects. In that case, however, youths from involuntary institutions who are drafted should perform no worse than those from other centers. This issue is testable and will be examined below.

Discharge. The temporally final manifestation of the quality of military service - discharge after the required 3 years of service for males and 2 years for females - may be summarized as follows. At the time IDF data files were transferred to us, 756 soldiers (34%), most recruited in 1982, had not yet completed their mandatory military service; another 17.2% had been discharged early. In other words, 48.8% had completed their full terms of service, and another 34% may still do so in the future.

Major reasons for discharge from the IDF at earlier than planned dates included the following: rejection by the army due to disciplinary problems, or because the soldier's continuing service was deemed unnecessary (9.9%);* lowered medical profile due to illness, traffic or other accidents, or injury during active duty (3.9%); and personal reasons such as family or economic problems (2.8%).

---

* There is no clear distinction at source between these two reasons; consequently, they are combined here.

Again, we find considerable institutional differences with respect to early discharge ($x^2(24) = 430.77$, $p < .001$). High early discharge rates were obtained for graduates of the involuntary Youth Protection system (59.7%, of whom 67.5% are discharged at the initiative of the IDF), and to a lesser extent in the Unit for Girls in Distress (32.7%), where personal reasons (mostly religious observance, marriage, and pregnancy) were dominant. An equally high level of early discharge was found in the two community programs (Education and Labor and Social Affairs street groups: 28.7% and 33.6% respectively) and among entirely disattached youths (30.5%). On the other hand, voluntary residential centers exhibited a more positive pattern (Youth Aliyah - 14.6%; Labor and Social Affairs - 13.8%; Mechinot for younger children - 16.1%; and unique residential centers at a somewhat higher 22.3%).

There is a considerable overlap between this distribution and that pertaining to recruitment; this appears to suggest either that different rehabilitation frameworks prepare youths with differential success both for recruitment and for the service itself, or that youths with different potential are selected or self-select into these institutions, and that this same potential ultimately affects both their recruitment and service.* This pattern also constitutes a partial answer to the question posed above: the performance of inmates of involuntary institutions appears to be as handicapped as their recruitment rates. These differences, while in service, can hardly be attributed to stigmatization, so that we will have to search for explanatory factors elsewhere. Generally speaking, the issue of selection versus causation is a complex one in all the analyses in this study; we cannot claim to have satisfactorily resolved it, and there may well be no unequivocal solution. Nonetheless, we shall see in chapter 8 that more rigorously controlled analyses diminish between-program differences, suggesting that military performance is affected by demographic, social and educational background characteristics - and even these only marginally - and less attributable to program impacts.

---

* It is interesting to note - though not easily explicable - that graduates of the two unique institutions may constitute an exception to this general rule: their background characteristics (cf. Table 5) as well as their IDF intake data (e.g., ability groupings) are relatively disadvantageous, whereas their recruitment rates are high and the rates of early discharge are low.

Courses. The IDF conducts a total of over 2000 courses at all levels of ability and career development, some even prior to recruitment. While many of these courses are clearly not applicable to the population examined here (e.g., where high ability levels are required, courses for career soldiers, etc.), the remaining options are numerous enough to make any descriptive account impossible. We will therefore restrict ourselves here to the two most general indices: the number of courses completed, and the type and quality of the last course completed. Note that while these variables do provide some general sense of the quality of the youth's military service, they are not necessarily unproblematic: for example, the type of course is almost by definition often correlated with medical profile and ability groupings. The choice of courses is also hardly ever solely at the soldier's discretion. In other words, enrollment in military courses is, at least in part, a function of the military's assessment of the soldier's capacities, and of its manpower needs at the time. Nonetheless, the military's decision to enroll a soldier in a given course, and certainly the soldier's success in it, may also be considered as indicative of the overall quality of his or her service.

With these caveats in mind, we note first that the extent of disattached sample's enrollment in military courses is quite considerable: overall, 8.2% were listed as having enrolled in no courses,* and the remaining distribution was as follows: one course - 29.3%, two courses - 28.3%, three courses - 18.7%, and four or more courses - 15.6%. The average number of courses was 2.13, with youths from involuntary Youth Protection Agency centers ($\bar{x} = 1.65$) and females from the Unit for Girls in Distress ($\bar{x} = 1.30$) exhibiting significantly lower levels of participation.

Turning now to the type of the most recent course, we find the following overall distribution: no courses listed - 8.2%; pre-military and basic training and/or educational enrichment as last course - 39.5%; combat and/or officers' or other command courses - 6.2%; vocational courses such as car mechanics, electricians, technicians, basic electronics, paramedics, operation of heavy equipment, etc. - 4.8%; drivers' courses (different vehicles, except combat) - 17.6%; and miscellaneous courses (e.g., clerical, weaponry, cooking, maintenance, storage, military police, etc.) - the remaining 23.8%. These distinct types or courses were distributed among graduates of different rehabilitation frameworks as indicated in Table 11.

The differences displayed in Table 13 are highly significant ($x^2(40) = 329.63$, $p < .0001$). Beyond the obvious - e.g., the low participation of females from the Girls in Distress Unit in combat (0.2%) and in driving courses (0.5%),** the following points are noteworthy. First, a uniformly high percentage of disattached soldiers do not advance beyond the basic training course (39.5%), although there is some variation among frameworks (graduates of Youth Aliyah centers, Ministry of Social Affairs institutions, both types of street groups, and entirely disattached youths are more likely to proceed further than those in the remaining frameworks). This pattern of distribution among different types of courses is less prevalent or almost absent in the general population, where soldiers are likely to move beyond basic training into professional or command courses. We will reexamine this pattern from a slightly different perspective below, in the section entitled "type of service".

---

* These data are apparently erroneous, as all recruits must undergo basic training, which itself should be listed as a course. The IDF also considers this documentation erroneous, but has, at this point, been unable to correct it.

** This, of course, is true for female soldiers in general: their rate of participation is 1.1% in combat units, and 0.8% in driving courses.

Table 13. Quality of Military Course (Last Course Completed) in Different Rehabilitation Frameworks

Courses Framework	0	1	2	3	4	5
			(Percent)			
Youth Aliyah	7.8	32.3	14.1	8.3	13.0	24.5
Vocational Training	0.0	44.4	8.3	12.5	13.9	20.8
Youth Protection	14.3	41.3	4.8	0.0	7.9	31.7
Unique Institutions	5.7	41.4	12.1	2.5	24.8	13.4
Community (Education)	5.1	41.2	3.7	4.3	26.7	19.1
Community (Social Affairs)	8.4	35.1	3.9	4.5	29.2	18.8
Girls in Distress	15.2	43.6	0.2	2.8	0.5	37.6
Younger Children (Res.)	1.8	41.8	8.1	6.3	22.1	20.0
Disattached youth	11.0	34.2	9.1	4.8	17.8	23.0
Entire Sample	8.2	39.5	6.2	4.8	17.6	23.8

0 - None listed
1 - Basic training, enrichment, education
2 - Combat, command
3 - Vocational: mechanics, electricians, electronics, paramedics, etc.
4 - Drivers (all except combat)
5 - Miscellaneous

For categories 1 through 5, see explanations in text.

Second, enrollment in virtually all vocational courses is negligible, with the exception of graduates of vocational training institutions, whose prior and partial training was undoubtedly used by the IDF as the most important criterion of selection into these courses; but even here participation rates are insubstantial. The most immediate implication of this finding is, of course, that only few youths can rely on their military service for professional advancement even if they had some prior civilian training. On the other hand, a disproportionate segment of the remaining youths is selected into driving courses. These courses are closed to youths with criminal records; consequently, only 7.9% of former inmates in Youth Protection centers are enrolled. The remaining soldiers attend various non-professional courses, with little if any career value. Given this distribution, we should not be surprised that the sample is ultimately also overrepresented in service jobs and units - as will be shown below.

One additional way of examining Table 13 is to compare the distribution of graduates from different types of rehabilitation programs to that among entirely disattached youths. We find that youths from two frameworks - Youth Aliyah institutions and Social Affairs community units - are most likely to advance beyond basic training courses, although their subsequent military career patterns are not necessarily advantageous. Graduates of two programs - Youth Aliyah centers and the two unique institutions - are most likely to enter into combat or command courses; these, while not necessarily conducive to subsequent civilian advancement, point to satisfactory military careers. Only graduates of vocational training (and to a lesser extent Youth Aliyah centers) have a significant advantage in professionally oriented military courses; and courses with little if any extended career value (categories 4, 5 in Table 13) are dominant among youths from all types of programs (1/3 or more), with no appreciable differences among them.*

Type of service. The IDF uses a ninefold distinction among job placements as follows: officer commissions, combat, maintenance, equipment operations, driving, intelligence, services and administration, civil defense, and miscellaneous. As some of these categories were occupied by very few members of our sample (e.g., officers and intelligence - less than 1%; equipment operations and civil defense - less than 5% each), while others were highly represented (e.g., services and administration - 46%; driving - 20%), we opted to base the analyses on a threefold distinction between officers' (as a special group worthy of attention), combat and intelligence, and all other, non-combat commissions. Even this distinction is not ideal for reliable analyses; the relative percentages are 0.4%, 8.6% and 91.1% respectively. Incidentally, we note that the placement of the general population of soldiers in the IDF is undoubtedly different, although the relevant data could not be obtained due to the privileged nature of this information.

When we now examine the institutional differences in military job placement, we should keep in mind that female soldiers differ considerably from males in this respect (100% vs. 87.9% are in service and administration jobs), so that rehabilitation frameworks absorbing primarily or exclusively girls (such as the Unit for Girls in Distress) should differ on a priori grounds from all-male or mixed programs. This is indeed the case. All recruits (100%) from the Unit for Girls in Distress find themselves in service and administration jobs; relatively high percentages (above 90%) in this category are also obtained for most other frameworks. Service and administration placements from Youth Aliyah Centers (82.5%), residential schools for youngsters (87.8%), entirely disattached youths (87.1%) and the two unique rehabilitation institutions (83.8%) are significantly though insubstantially lower. Youths from the latter institutions were also most likely to join combat units (16.2%); this pattern is statistically significant even after excluding the Unit for Girls in Distress from the analysis ($x^2(14) = 44.30$, $p < .001$). We note again, however, that this dispersion into units and types of jobs can hardly be viewed as independent of other constraints imposed by the IDF, which may or may not vary over time: temporary manpower needs, tests of ability at intake, and particularly medical profiles - including the mental health clause, which is relatively prevalent in this population. While the variables affecting manpower processing in the IDF are of little interest here, we must be careful not to overinterpret the consistency of findings regarding ability groupings, medical profiles, courses, units, etc., which may well be intercorrelated at the structural (i.e., IDF policies) rather than at the individual level. What is needed here are multivariate analyses to examine the net institutional differences in compound variables reflecting the youths' adaptation to military service; such analyses are now in progress.

---

* Except, perhaps, Social Affairs community units, where close to 50% of participants are enrolled in such courses.

Military rank. One additional indicator of the quality of service is the highest rank obtained in the IDF. As only very few soldiers in our sample attained the highest ranks possible during mandatory service (usually sergeant), we collapsed the scale into four categories, as follows: private (44,2%), lance-corporal (6.2%), corporal (33.6%), and sergeant and above (16.0%), which includes a very small number of commissioned officers. Again, the differences among the nine types of rehabilitation frameworks are highly significant ($x^2(24) = 238.09$, $p < .001$). Relatively few soldiers from the Unit for Girls in Distress (21.0%), the Youth Aliyah institutions (31.3%), and vocational training centers (34.7%) remained privates throughout their service; the majority of all others except entirely disattached youths (43.9%), however, did not advance in rank at all. Soldiers from the Girls in Distress Unit were also most likely to attain ranks of sergeant or higher (31.4%); the other three above-mentioned frameworks ranged between 18% and 20%, whereas in all other residential and community frameworks the percentage of soldiers attaining the rank of sergeant or higher was below 10%. It should be noted that this rank is customarily achieved by most soldiers not commissioned for officers prior to discharge as part of their regular promotions. In other words, the promotion of disattached youths is hardly on par with that of the general population.

Disciplinary problems. We now turn to one final and perhaps most direct indicator of the quality of military performance: negative encounters with the military authorities, or disciplinary problems. We will examine two manifestations of such problems: desertions, and incarcerations in military jails. Both these behavioral indices may be expressed as either time spans (number of days absent or in jail) or frequencies (number of times deserting or in jail). Institutional differences on these two measures are roughly equivalent; the former (time spans) is preferred since its range is greater, and the distributions of the time span measure are less skewed.

It should also be noted that the IDF recognizes two types of desertion, the first extending up to 14 days, and the second reflecting any absence beyond that period. Lengthier desertions are judged by more senior officers, and punished more severely.

Generally, 64.5% of the sampled soldiers had no record of desertions, and 82.3% had no record of desertions above 14 days. The average number of days of desertion, however, was quite substantial ($\bar{x} = 33.66$ days); the average soldier absented himself more than once for 14 days or less ($\bar{x} = 1.33$); and the most extreme case of absence from military service lasted a full 897 days - that is, more than 2/3 of the total service period. Jail sentences were also quite frequent ($\bar{x} = .86$) and lengthy ($\bar{x} = 12.78$); the longest jail term accumulated by a single soldier lasted 156 days.

All one-way analyses of variance on these indices of discipline-related behavior are highly significant, and the overall patterns of differences among types of rehabilitation frameworks, as displayed in Table 14, are roughly equivalent - thus creating a consistent picture. We note that the two unique residential institutions, as well as both types (Education and Social Affairs) of community programs for males (street groups) exhibit severe disciplinary problems on all dimensions examined. Soldiers who had been inmates in involuntary institutions of the Youth Protection Agency fare only marginally better, although they are surprisingly underrepresented in military incarceration statistics. Female soldiers from the Unit for Girls in Distress exhibit the lowest levels on all disciplinary difficulties, as do females in this sample and in the population in general; nonetheless, the amount of non-productive time spent by female soldiers while deserting and while in jail is still higher than even that in the general male population. Among voluntary rehabilitation frameworks, youths from Youth Aliyah institutions fare best on all dimensions of disciplinary problems. Note that on all these measures, the performance of entirely (non-absorbed) disattached youths falls in between voluntary institutions and the other programs, though not in an

Table 14. Selected Disciplinary Problems of Disattached Youth in the IDF: By Type of Rehabilitation Framework

Framework	Desertions (Total) No. of days ($\bar{x}$)	Desertions (<14 days) No. of times ($\bar{x}$)	Desertions (>14 days) No. of times ($\bar{x}$)	Jail Terms No. of days ($\bar{x}$)	Jail Terms No. of times
Youth Aliyah Residential	22.61	.97	.31	10.09	.72
Labor & Social Affairs - Residential	26.03	1.24	.33	15.24	1.01
Youth Protection - Involuntary	45.86	1.54	.63	13.03	.92
Unique Institutions	52.39	1.80	.66	22.74	1.39
Community - Education	48.12	1.83	.59	18.74	1.23
Community - Labor & Social Affairs	58.50	1.75	.70	18.90	1.25
Girls in Distress	8.26	.38	.07	1.95	.17
Res. Schools - younger children	28.18	1.20	.38	13.20	.87
Disattached (not absorbed)	33.50	1.28	.38	10.60	.78

equidistant manner; graduates of voluntary institutions perform marginally better than disattached youths, while participants in community programs (except girls) and inmates of involuntary institutions exhibit significantly more disciplinary problems.

Summary

In summarizing these findings regarding military performance up to this point, it should be emphasized that they do not, by any means, represent real differences among the rehabilitation frameworks. This is the case because all the analyses in this chapter (as well as in the preceding one on delinquency) are of the first order - i.e., do not consider possible differences in the populations absorbed by the various programs. In other words, it is not possible to determine, at this point, whether the observed differences in military performance are due to the fact that youths from some institutions are ill-prepared for military service (and, by implication, have perhaps not been adequately rehabilitated), or to the fact that their individual characteristics, even prior to program intake, were such that they were predisposed to failure while in the army. In short, then, our analyses have so far not come to grips with the issue of selection (different populations in different programs, who are consequently differentially predisposed to fail) *versus* causation (differential program impacts on these youths, which cause or contribute differentially to the quality of military performance). We shall examine this issue in more detail in the following chapter by introducing selected individual background characteristics as statistical controls into the analyses - although we should note immediately that due to problems of measurement and inadequate data quality, the selection vs. causation question cannot be resolved completely even by the most sophisticated statistical techniques.

We also observe that some of the dependent variables in the preceding analyses are by definition intercorrelated, so that the soldiers' performance should be examined in its entirety, rather than as a series of completely independent indicators. For example, desertion (especially if prolonged) is in most cases punished by incarceration, so that deserting soldiers have a higher probability of serving military jail terms on an *a priori* basis.

Keeping these caveats in mind, we may note the following. Youths from different rehabilitation programs are distributed unequally on virtually all military intake and performance indicators. As noted, youths from unique residential, and particularly involuntary institutions, receive considerably lower medical profiles than all other sample members. We hypothesize that these differences are primarily due to the predominance of mental health and "behavioral disturbance" (primarily known delinquency which has since been entered separately into the recruit's record) clauses.

There are similar differences in "ability grouping" scores, which reflect objective factors (years of schooling) as well as cognitive and motivational tests. Interestingly, inmates from involuntary institutions do not do as badly here as their schooling record (see Table 4) woud have suggested, while male participants of both community programs do worse. It may well be that the former compensated for their lack of formal education by higher cognitive, language or motivational scores. The data do not permit us to test this contention, and it appears somewhat unlikely on an a priori basis. We also note that graduates of both Youth Aliyah and vocational training centers received the highest scores on both medical profiles and ability groupings, although reductions in profiles during service were frequent.

These intake data correspond only moderately well to actual rates of recruitment. Youths from all voluntary residential institutions were most likely to be recruited, with rates ranging in the 70's to 80's; this rate is discrepant with the above-reviewed intake data for at least one framework (the two unique institutions, where graduates exhibited both low medical profiles and low ability groupings, but high recruitment rates). This discrepancy may well be due to special efforts made by the staff of these centers to get graduates accepted by the IDF.

The relatively low recruitment rate of females in the Unit for Girls in Distress is probably due to the high frequency of discharge for special considerations (religiosity, pregnancy, marriage) in this population. Inmates of Youth Protection Agency involuntary centers were by far the least likely to be recruited (only 28.6%). This rate, however, is by and large consistent with the corresponding intake data (profiles, ability groupings), and is in most cases to be explained by the IDF's reluctance to recruit youths with criminal records. This point is significant, as it implies that recruitment per se is not a valid indicator of the rehabilitation of youths from these involuntary centers, since no institutional efforts can erase the youth's criminal past. On the other hand, the military performance of those ex-inmates who have been drafted despite their criminal record is undoubtedly meaningful across the sample as a whole.

In examining military performance itself, we have highlighted a series of (partly interrelated) indices, including the completion of a full term of service, the quality of courses, the promotion in ranks, and disciplinary problems. In principle, the same groups that were under-recruited by the IDF also suffered from a high early discharge rate. It is likely that the high propensity of females to receive early discharges was due to both reductions in medical profile (which were frequent here) and changes in marital status. Among inmates in involuntary institutions and members of community advancement units, on the other hand, early discharge may most likely be traced to frequent or severe disciplinary problems.

For all other aspects of military careers, we find a relatively consistent picture. Graduates of Youth Aliyah institutions and vocational training centers did relatively well on all counts: promotions (joined by members of the Unit for Girls in Distress, for whom the military promotion sequence is different); the quality of military courses (Youth Aliyah graduates tended to gravitate more toward combat courses,* whereas youths from vocational centers were naturally more likely to join vocational courses); and the low frequency of disciplinary problems (desertions and jail terms) - although females were least likely to transgress here, probably due to psychological differences. On the other hand, and with some between-measure variance, participants in the two community programs (Youth Advancement Units), residents in the two unique institutions, and inmates of involuntary centers did significantly worse on all these accounts. Interestingly, disattached youths who had not joined any rehabilitation framework did substantially better than these last groups, but worse than graduates of Youth Aliyah and vocational training centers. It may be noteworthy that graduates of these latter two frameworks, who exhibited the better military adjustment on all dimensions, had attended institutions with heterogeneous populations in terms of educational background and abilities - whereas all other frameworks absorbed only disattached youths.

As already noted above, these patterns are not to be interpreted as reflecting the net impact of the rehabilitation programs examined, as these may be confounded with real individual differences among participants in these programs. We now (in chapter 8) turn to a close examination of this complex issue.

---

* Graduates of the two unique institutions were also prevalent here, despite their relative disadvantage in intake data, and especially regarding medical profiles.

8. REHABILITATING DISATTACHED YOUTH: A COMPARISON OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

We now turn to the logical conclusion of this report. So far, we have examined differences among participants in the eight types of rehabilitation programs and the subsample of entirely disattached youths along three general dimensions: background attributes or other social and motivational characteristics at intake (chapter 4); delinquent activities (chapter 6); and indices of the quality of military service.

As I have pointed out repeatedly, all these comparisons reflect "zero-order relationships", in the sense that they indicate only whether and to what extent graduates of these programs differ, but not whether these differences are a function of their participation in a given rehabilitation framework, or of other factors such as selection. In other words, we have yet to determine to what extent any of the observed differences are uniquely attributable to the impact of a given program or group of programs; only the identification of such a "net difference" would speak directly to the question of program effectiveness.

This goal, however, is more easily stated than achieved. In the present context, we encounter two major difficulties in any attempt to arrive at valid causal statements about the relationship between specific (categories of) rehabilitation programs and individual outcomes. One of these problems has already been alluded to in this report; the other will become of major concern only in the context of our attempt to draw causal inferences to be promoted in the present chapter.

First, let us review once again the first problem. One of the principal requirements for our ability to attribute differences among conditions (here - rehabilitation programs) causally to these conditions, is the random assignment of subjects (here, youths) (e.g., Blalock, 1961). This requirement is, of course, the raison d'etre of experimental designs, which are based on the principle of randomization. In contrast, the design of the current study is non-experimental, as it utilizes extant programs as conditions for statistical comparison, so that we have no experimental control over the selection of youths into these programs.

On an a priori basis, there is little reason to expect that youths would be randomly selected (or would randomly select themselves) into the different programs and institutions in the Israeli rehabilitation system; this would run counter to the very logic behind such a variegated system. Indeed, as we have seen in chapter 4, there are a number of differences among some of the program groupings - particularly with respect to youths' level of delinquent activity, but also on several additional dimensions - even though these appear to be somewhat less impressive and internally consistent than one might have expected.

These patent or measured differences in the background characteristics of youths absorbed by different programs, however, are less problematic than other, unmeasured or unmeasurable characteristics that may differentiate among youths participating in different programs. In a non-experimental design such as the present one, such latent differences may create a confounding between a given condition (i.e., program), and a given (unknown and unmeasured) attribute, with respect to which partipant youths are unique, or at least extreme. Whereas the contribution of known or measured individual attributes may be statistically partialled out by regression or analysis of variance techniques so as to estimate "pure" program effects,* no such simple solution exists for the identification of the impact of latent variables.

In sum, then, given that the design of this study is by definition non-experimental - as youths are not randomly assigned to rehabilitation programs, and as we took these programs as pre-established conditions - we ultimately may or may not be able to draw causal inferences about program effects even in the extended analyses to be presented here. The possibility that youths with different unknown characteristics are selected into different programs will continue to exist. Nonetheless, before we entirely dismiss any possibility of valid causal inference, we should attend to the substantive meaning of such a latent selective process. For it to vitiate the validity of a causal inference regarding the impact of a given program on a given individual outcome, we have to assume that all of the following conditions pertain:

1. There in fact exists one or more unique but unknown or unmeasured attributes which differentiates between participants in one program and those in another (i.e., programs are confounded with individual background variables). Recall, however, that this study utilizes all the background data available to the rehabilitation system. This implies that even if such attributes do exist, rehabilitation officials themselves are unable to utilize them for selection and intake; it therefore may well be that the distribution of youths among programs on the basis of such attributes is random after all.

---

* Although, strictly speaking, these techniques also presuppose randomized designs. In practice, however, they are frequently utilized in cases such as the present one.

2. These unmeasured attributes, if they in fact differentiate among participants in different programs, are uncorrelated or at least only marginally correlated with attributes that have been measured. If these correlations are substantial, the effects of these unmeasured characteristics are at least in part accounted for by introducing measured (and correlated) attributes as covariates into the analysis. For example, if we assume that a hypothetical and unmeasurable construct such as "the motivation to join normative social structures" differentiates among youths who join different rehabilitation programs, but is also highly correlated with the (measured) level of delinquency, introducing the latter as one predictor of, for example, military performance would indirectly and partially account for the effect of the former.
3. The unmeasured attribute has to be assumed to affect the outcome either directly, or via a statistical interaction with other attributes and/or with program characteristics.

I would submit that probability of these three conditions to obtain in conjunction with one another is limited, thus leaving few grounds to attribute the present findings to the presumed effects of "unmeasured characteristics". In fact, my own tendency in the pages to follow is to discount the narrow interpretation of the findings in terms of "selectivity" (i.e., participants in the various programs differ, and therefore evince different outcomes), and to promote an interpretation based on "effectiveness" (i.e., different programs product different outcomes beyond variations in participants' characteristics).

We now turn to the second problem mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, which may also affect the validity of any attempt to draw causal inferences from these data. This problem concerns the *appropriate unit of analysis*, and it has received extensive attention in the (particularly educational) literature - with mixed results and less than unequivocal conclusions. Theoretical and statistical treatments, reviews and summaries of issues related to the problem of units of analysis may be found, for example, in Burstein (1985; 1978); Hopkins (1982); Burstein, Linn & Capell (1978); Hannan & Burstein (1974); and others.*

The discussion on the appropriate unit of analysis in nonexperimental designs is too complex, technical and polemical to be reviewed here in its entirety; we shall content ourselves with an overview of the basic issues involved. In the terms used in the literature cited above (e.g., Burnstein, 1985; Burnstein et al., 1978), the data collected in this study are of *multiple levels*: on the one hand they concern the performance (delinquency, military service) of *individual* youths, which consequently dictates individual-level analyses. On the other hand, these youths are subdivided into *populations* which participated in specific programs or institutions (in our case - aggregated categories of programs or institutions). As such, these youths are presumably affected by the educational, rehabilitational, etc. processes occurring in these programs as *collectivities* rather than as individuals. The basic dilemma posed by the choice between these two types of units of analysis is that the effects of a given treatment on the aggregate population undergoing it may, under certain circumstances, be fundamentally different from its correspondent effects on individual participants.

---

* It is perhaps of historical interest to note that the consequent controversy may be traced back further to the theme of "ecological correlations" or "ecological fallacy" originally raised by Lindquist (1940); see also Robinson (1950); Goodman (1959); and Alker (1969) for a more recent review.

The choice of the unit of analysis, in turn, has a number of measurement and statistical consequences: for example, individual-level analyses by definition require individual scores (e.g., of performance), whereas aggregate-level analyses mandate the construction of some measure of central tendencies in the population (medians, means, standard deviations, etc.); this measure then comprises the data for analysis. The aggregate level of analysis presumably increases measurement reliability, but significantly decreases the probability of identifying any existing differences among programs (e.g., Haney, 1980) - as degrees of freedom are now contingent upon the number of programs rather than on the number of participants studied. Relatedly, aggregate analyses render the identification of population characteristics by program interactions (which are not unlikely in nonexperimental designs) virtually impossible (e.g., Page, 1975).

In practice, then, this dilemma in part expresses itself in the potential risk of Type A or Type B errors of statistical inference - depending on whether we opt for individual or aggregate-level analysis. While several types of "mixed models", using regression slopes, decompositions of between-program and polled within-program effects, etc. have been advanced (e.g., Burstein et al., 1978; Cronbach, 1976; Cronbach & Webb, 1975; Hopkins, 1982),* the basic question remains a conceptual one: Are we primarily concerned with the outcomes individual youths accrue from their participation in a given rehabilitation setting and as a function of their background attributes, and ultimately in the linkages between individual behavior and specific characteristics of the system? Or, alternatively, are we primarily concerned with the overall effectiveness of the rehabilitation system and its parts, perhaps as Burstein (1985) has put it, attempting to generate information that contributes to some decision? In the former case, individual-level analyses would be most appropriate; in the latter, aggregate data should probably be examined. Both objectives are clearly pertinent to the present study; yet the multilevel approaches proposed, among others, by Burstein et al. (1978), Cronbach (1976), and Hopkins (1982) are probably too complex to be appropriate for this report. Moreover, it does appear that the primary theoretical (see chapter 2) and empirical (especially if we consider the collection of data on institutional attributes; see chapter 5) emphases pertain to individual-level outcomes and to interactions of individual characteristics with institutional attributes. While this conclusion may be disputed by some, we shall use the analyses appropriate to this argument below.

---

* But even these, as well as any other techniques relying on pooled measures (means, etc.), do not necessarily resolve the problem of nonindependence among observational units (Hopkins, 1982). Consequently Hopkins allows for the use of individual data as units of analysis, especially when considerations such as individual characteristics x program interactions or generalizability are prominent.

Before turning to these final analyses, however, let us briefly return to the first problem raised in this chapter: the possibility of uncontrolled selection and self-selection among institutions. In order to avoid some of the pitfalls associated with this problem, we chose first to conduct a series of multiple comparisons between categories of rehabilitation programs and the (non-systematic) comparison group of disattached youths who had not joined any framework. In these comparisons, delinquency (number of criminal records prior to entry into program for criminal involvement outcomes; total number of criminal records for military service outcomes) was chosen as a sole covariate (control variable). These comparisons were employed as a conservative measure in order to examine first whether the performance of youths in the different programs differed systematically from that of entirely disattached youths. As we shall see, the findings from this series of comparisons are virtually equivalent to those derived from more extended multiple regression analyses, which compare the various rehabilitation programs directly, and introduce additional control variables. The summary of results regarding the comparisons between categories of rehabilitation programs and the sample of entirely disattached youths are presented in Table 15; these should be read in conjunction with the findings presented in the remainder of this chapter.

Table 15 may be summarized as follows. We compare the short-term outcomes accruing to youths who had participated in one of the 15 types of programs listed in Table 15 (i.e, who presumably underwent some sort of treatment designed to facilitate their social readjustment) to those of youths who remained outside any structured framework of education or work (entirely disattached; i.e., who experienced no treatment whatsoever). At this point in the analysis, we controlled for only one of the potential differences between treated and untreated youths: the extent of their criminal involvement (number of criminal records), which was introduced as a covariate into the model. The rationale behind the choice of this particular variable as a primary control measure is self-evident, as it is criminal involvement that most convincingly distinguishes among youths in different programs - and in particular between inmates of Youth Protection Agency institutions and hostels and all others (see Table 4).

Table 15. Comparisons of Selected Individual Outcomes: Aggregated Rehabilitation Programs vs. Untreated Youths[1]

Aggregated Programs	No. Criminal Records	No. Convictions	Most Severe Conviction[4]	Military Recruitment	Military Jail (No. Days)[5]
Youth Aliyah					
Vocational Training					
Youth Protection Centers - (Males)[2]	$\bar{x}=32.26$	$\bar{x}=11.78$	$\bar{x}=1.07$	19%	
Youth Protection Centers - (Females)	$\bar{x}=4.00$	$\bar{x}=2.30$	$\bar{x}=2.41$		
Youth Protection Hostels - (Males)	$\bar{x}=19.41$		$\bar{x}=1.00$		
Youth Protection Hostels - (Females)	$\bar{x}=3.00$		$\bar{x}=2.53$		
Preparatory School A[3]				75%	
B				81%	
C				82%	
Hachsharot (Kibbutzim)					
Unique Institutions			$\bar{x}=2.91$		$\bar{x}=23.33$
Girls in Distress				51%	
Youth Advancement (Ed.)					
Youth Advancement (Soc.Aff.)				59%	
Youth Advancement (Mixed)					$\bar{x}=21.83$
Untreated Youths (All)	$\bar{x}=2.43$	$\bar{x}=1.90$	$\bar{x}=5.58$	57%	$\bar{x}=10.60$
Males	$\bar{x}=3.92$	$\bar{x}=3.60$	$\bar{x}=5.14$	74%	$\bar{x}=13.19$
Females	$\bar{x}=0.31$	$\bar{x}=0.92$	$\bar{x}=6.00$	33%	$\bar{x}=2.37$

1. All comparisons (including military recruitment, which have been transposed from a dummy variable to percentage points to ease readability) are based on ANACOVA's, with the total number of criminal records (for military service outcomes) or the number of records prior to entry into the program (for delinquency outcomes) as a single covariate or control variable. All entries in the table reflect comparisons between a given program and untreated youths significant at $p < .0001$. This restrictive level was chosen due to the large number of comparisons necessitated by this analysis.
2. Results for all non-coeducational programs are best compared to the corresponding statistics for male or female untreated youths respectively. These are listed at the bottom of the table.
3. In line with the policy followed throughout this report, these institutions are not identified by name.
4. A number of additional but isolated indicators of criminal involvement also yield significant findings not listed in this table (see text).
5. There are no additional significant differences between program participants and untreated youths on any other measures of the quality of military performance (courses, promotions, type of unit, and short-term or extended desertions).

After controlling for the rate of youths' officially recorded delinquent behavior, we discern the following patterns:

1. The total, and certainly the relative number of outcome differences between program participants and untreated (entirely disattached) youths is evidently very limited. Table 15 is extracted from a total of 162 comparisons (nine variables reflecting delinquent involvement and an equal number reflecting military performance, where participants in 15 programs were compared to entirely disattached youths for each variable). Of these, only 37 comparisons (22.8%) were statistically significant at the chosen probability level of p .0001 (including 16 isolated but significant differences on measures of criminal activity, such as yet unprocessed criminal records, total number of verdicts, and verdicts without conviction - all not listed in Table 13).* Most of these differences pertained to institutions and hostels of the Youth Protection Agency, and to one single variable: the rate of military recruitment. Taken at face value, this pattern of findings hardly attests to an unequivocal or paramount advantage accruing to participants in any of these rehabilitation programs; as we shall see, the opposite may be the case.

2. Turning now to measures of delinquency, we find a partially consistent and high level of criminal involvement among inmates of Youth Protection Agency programs as compared to untreated youths, and particularly among those in closed institutions. As noted in the preceding footnote, this pattern holds true for other measures of delinquency (i.e., not presented in Table 15) as well. The only other group for which an indication of higher

---

* However, these measures are by definition intercorrelated. Consequently, 14 of these 16 significant comparisons involve youths from the same programs (run by the Youth Protection Agency) implicated as most delinquent by the findings in Table 13.

levels of delinquency exists are participants in unique institutions, who were significantly more likely than untreated youths to have as yet unprocessed criminal records and verdicts without conviction, and who received significantly more severe sentences.*

It should be emphasized that these findings pertain to an analysis in which pre-entry levels of delinquency (number of criminal records) are controlled, so that these initial levels of criminal behavior - which are particularly high among participants in Youth Protection Agency programs - cannot account for the patterns delineated here. On the other hand, these same programs are also unique in that they are required to lodge a complaint against any youths suspected of a criminal offense while in residence.** It is, however, quite unlikely that the extreme differences between participants in Youth Protection Agency programs and untreated youths in virtually all measures of criminal behavior, are due entirely to this unique property of these particular institutions. Moreover, and as already adumbrated at the beginning of this chapter, it is highly unlikely that inmates in these institutions differ from untreated youths on one of more unmeasured (or not yet introduced into the analysis) characteristics that are both uncorrelated with pre-entry delinquency, and at the same time somehow antecedent to post-program criminal involvement. It follows, as a preliminary conclusion to be reexamined, that youths who participated in Youth Protection Agency programs - and to a lesser extent those in the two unique institutions - may well have experienced an *increase* in post-program criminal involvement which is significantly greater than chance (i.e., which differs from fluctuations sustained by untreated youths).

---

* Note again that lower mean scores reflect more severe sentencing; see footnote 2 to Table 10, where category A is scored 1, B=2, etc.

** Recall that measures of criminal behavior while in residence and during the post-program period were combined for the purpose of these analyses.

3. Many of the differences between treated and untreated youths pertain to their chances of being recruited by the IDF. We note again that criminal involvement, which serves as one - and for these youths perhaps as one of the principal - criteria for military drafting decisions, are controlled for in this analysis. We note also, however, that military recruitment rates represent the variable that yields the *least* meaningful result of the current analysis. Recall that IDF recruitment is based on a number of criteria. These include, in addition to delinquency, also medical profiles and ability groupings (e.g., education, language and cognitive skills); participants in some rehabilitation programs differ significantly on these intake variables, as do untreated youths from program participants. We shall therefore reserve our judgment in regard to differences in the rate of military recruitment to the analyses introducing more relevant control variables, to be reported below.

4. Perhaps the most surprising finding regarding actual military performance variables is that so few differences between program participants and untreated youths exist.* It appears that with the exception of one measure of military discipline (days served in jail) which is to the detriment of participants in two of the programs (unique institutions, and mixed Youth Advancement units) in comparison to untreated youths, the military careers of

---

* Two of 120 comparisons, or 1.7%, are significant at p .001. If we disregard those analyses involving highly intercorrelated measures (e.g., number od days and number of times in prison), the corresponding rate is 3.7%.

disattached youths do not appear to either benefit or suffer from participants' experience with rehabilitation programs.

We now turn to our second option of analytic procedures by applying more extended regression models to these data. Given the two problems of the ambiguity of the appropriate unit for analysis, and especially of the non-random assignment of individuals to treatments, it might be argued that such models are, strictly speaking, not suitable here. However, we note that multiple regression models will enable us to examine at least the contribution of measured (though not of latent) intake variables to individual outcomes, thereby increasing predictive power and enabling us to examine "purer" program effects. Consequently, findings from this analysis should be more directly relevant to policy decisions. We note also that these regression models will permit a look at the differences among the rehabilitation programs themselves (rather than only between each program and the group of untreated youths). This will give us greater flexibility, and circumvent some of the impediments of the preceding analysis (e.g., multiple comparisons).

In the regression models to follow, we chose the following categorization of rehabilitation programs - primarily so as to reduce the number of categories and to increase the sample available for analysis in each:

(1) Youth Aliyah Residential centers are considered jointly with the Hachsharot in Kibbutzim (which are also run by the Youth Aliyah); these serve as basic comparison level with respect to all other programs, which are entered as dummy variables into the regressions (i.e., their beta-weights in the models are zero).

(2) Labor and Social Affairs vocational training centers.

(3) Youth Protection Agency institutions, including hostels.

(4) The two unique Residential Centers.

(5) Ministry of Education Youth Advancement units.

(6) Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs Youth Advancement units. All "joint" units were combined with the category (5 or 6 respectively) with which they were primarily affiliated.

(7) The Unit for Girls in Distress.

Preparatory schools (Mechinot) and the subsample of entirely disattached youths are not included in these models, as no data beyond those on criminal involvement are available for these groups. As noted, the aggregation of categories of programs is due primarily to constraints of sample size, rather than to substantive considerations.*

The seven types of treatment programs are entered as dummy variables (with Youth Aliyah institutions as baseline) in predicting individual outcomes of delinquency and military performance. Delinquency - i.e., the number of criminal records - is entered as an additional predictor variable, utilizing the number of pre-program records to predict post-program delinquency outcomes, and the total number of records to predict military performance. Additional variables entered into the regression models are: father's origin (dummy variable: Israel, Asia/Africa, other); father's education (dummy variable: full or partial elementary education; above elementary education);

---

* We note that the Hebrew version of this report, to be published concomitantly, includes a series of appendices which tabulate all individual outcomes of interest by more highly differentiated categories of programs (similar to the distinctions drawn in Table 13 above). These tabulations also include Mechinot for youngsters and the subsample of entirely disattached (untreated) youths, which we were forced to drop from the regression models. These appendices represent zero-order relationships (i.e., without introducing control variables). The absence of those may be only marginally restrictive, however, as the present analyses do not attest to their predictive power.

father's occupational status (dummy variable: permanent and consistent employment, impermanent and inconsistent employment, unemployed, other - e.g., unknown, retired, in jail, etc.); youth's sex (effect-coded); youth's living arrangements (dummy variable: with both parents; other); family integrity (dummy variable: complete unit; one or both parents absent); and the existence of limiting physical or mental illness in the family (dummy variable). The selection of these specific independent variables over others listed in Table 5 may be contested; they do, however, represent most of the dimensions that differentiate even marginally among participants in the various programs. Excluded are the youths' years of education - perhaps one might argue, unjustifiably - and all those measures which could be ascertained only for a relatively small portion of the sample.* The decision to select specific individual background characteristics as predictor variables rather than to enter them _in toto_ into the models, rests once again, on considerations of sample size.

Two final notes: First, while the problem of intercorrelated independent variables is partially resolved here by deleting certain measures from the analysis (e.g., mother's education, employment, etc.), some problems could not be resolved (e.g., the correlation between some programs and participants' gender is at unity). In these cases we preferred to accept the multicolinearity risk, rather than excluding crucial variables from the model. Second, all analyses are based on non-recursive regression models. For now, we shall disregard the unlikely possibility that individual background characteristics and program categories, or their respective error terms, are reciprocally related.

---

* All remaining missing data problems are handled by pairwise deletion.

Table 16. Regression Analyses of Rehabilitation Frameworks and Selected Background Characteristics on Number of Criminal Offenses[1]

Independent Variable	TOTAL NO. OF OFFENSES Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)	OFFENSES DURING/AFTER INSTITUTION[11] Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)
Vocational Training[2]	-2.450	4.314	-.039	-.479	1.984	-.016
Youth Protection	18.608	3.383	.423**	5.640	1.619	.279**
Unique Institutions	2.333	3.612	.053	.331	1.663	.016
Street Groups - Education	-.356	2.882	-.013	1.060	1.326	.085
Street Groups - Social Affairs	1.156	3.530	.028	-.316	1.623	-.017
Girls in Distress	6.286	3.309	.239*	1.983	1.529	.163
Sex (Youth)[3]	-10.363	2.758	-.417**	-2.617	1.296	-.228*
Father's Origin - Israel[4]	-1.837	4.231	-.028	-.940	1.946	-.032
Father's Origin - Asia/Africa	.059	2.312	.002	-.207	1.063	-.013
Father's Employment - Irregular[5]	-.655	3.677	-.010	-.470	1.690	-.016
Father Unemployed	.241	2.315	.007	.028	1.065	.002
Father's Employment - Else[6]	-.253	1.965	-.009	.173	.904	.013
Father's Education - Elementary or less[7]	.033	1.523	.001	-.931	.701	-.081
Family Integrity[8]	1.556	2.822	.054	.151	1.300	.011
Living Arrangements[9]	.464	2.892	.015	-.554	1.336	-.039
Illness in Family[10]	-.655	1.817	-.024	2.617	1.296	.228*
Previous Offenses	—	—	—	.167	.039	.268**
Constant	13.724	8.354	—	4.490	3.857	—

1. For total offenses: F=4.15, $p < .001$, R^2=.216; For post-institutional offenses: F=4.05, $p < .001$, R^2=.223.
2. Youth Aliyah = 0
3. Male = 1, Female = 2
4. Europe, America = 0
5. Regular Employment = 0
6. Else = Unknown, deceased, in prison, overseas, retired
7. Above elementary = 0
8. One or both parents absent for any reason = 0
9. Youth not living with complete nuclear family = 0
10. No = 0
11. See chapter 6 for explication of how this variable was constructed.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

1. Delinquency

We now turn to the first group of dependent variables or individual outcomes to be examined with the regression model outlined above. Table 16 displays the unstandardized and the standardized regression coefficients for two dependent measures: total number of offenses (left-hand columns) and number of offenses committed during and after participation in the program (right-hand columns). As noted, program categories are dummied, with Youth Aliyah institutions as baseline. The maximal number of cases for any specific variable in this model is 2605, the minimal number 551 (father's education); recall that the pairwise deletion technique is utilized here.

The results for total number of offenses are of informational interest only, as this variable confounds pre-entry differences among youths with possible program effects. We note only that programs differ surprisingly little with respect to this measure, i.e., that most youths in the total sample differ only marginally with respect to their criminal involvement - with the exception of the expected sex differences, and the relatively high level of delinquency in the Youth Protection Agency programs and in the Unit for Girls in Distress. We note again that these may (and in part undoubtedly do) reflect pre-entry differences among youths.

Turning now to the right side of Table 16, things become somewhat clearer. While the proportion of the variance of post-program offenses explained by the model leaves much to be desired, it represents a slight improvement over that found for the total number of offenses (by 7%). Three background variables are implicated as affecting post-program delinquency: earlier criminal involvement which, as expected, has an incremental effect;

illness in the family, which increases the youths' propensity to transgress* (though surprisingly had no significant effect on the total number of offenses); and gender with, again not surprisingly, males accumulating significantly more criminal records than females. The only other finding of significance relates to the post-program delinquency rates of youths from Youth Protection Agency institutions and programs; they are the only group more likely to recidivate than the established baseline of Youth Aliyah graduates.

This pattern essentially replicates itself in Table 17, which presents the total number of convicted offenses (left-side panel) and convictions (right-side panel) as predicted by the same model outlined above. The basic reason for examining both these measures, which appear at first glance to be equivalent, is that a single verdict of guilty are often given for a number of accumulated offenses, especially when these reflect one single perpetration. The opposite may also be the case: offenders may be convicted for some offenses and acquitted on others - all perpetrated in the course of the same act. This not altogether surprising procedure may in fact work to the advantage of youths most heavily involved in criminal activities, as the total range of conviction will be more restricted than that of offenses. As we shall see immediately, however, this particular feature makes little if any difference in the overall pattern of findings.

---

* This effect, though not specifically predicted, is not particularly surprising, as family functioning, which is affected by illness, represents one major component of distressed background. However, neither family size nor delinquency in the family predicted the number of offenses (or any outcome variables to be discussed later); these two independent variables were ultimately included among those deleted entirely from all regression models, as they consistently failed to contribute to the explained variance.

Table 17. Regression Analyses of Rehabilitation Frameworks and Selected Background Characteristics on Number of Convicted Offenses and Convictions[1]

Independent Variable	NO. OF CONVICTED OFFENSES[10]			NO. OF CONVICTIONS[10]		
	Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)	Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)
Vocational Training[2]	-.834	2.318	-.023	-.175	.497	-.024
Youth Protection	8.936	1.818	.391*	2.346	.390	.462*
Unique Institutions	-.322	1.941	-.014	.214	.416	.042
Street Groups - Education	-.110	1.548	-.008	.142	.332	.045
Street Groups - Social Affairs	.045	1.900	-.002	.203	.406	.043
Girls in Distress	3.270	1.778	.239	.762	.381	.251
Sex (Youth)[3]	-4.478	1.482	-.346*	-1.090	.318	-.379*
Father's Origin - Israel[4]	-1.152	2.273	-.034	-.123	.487	-.017
Father's Origin - Asia/Africa	-.718	1.242	-.040	-.048	.266	-.012
Father's Employment - Irregular[5]	-.138	1.975	-.004	-.094	.423	-.013
Father Unemployed	.125	1.244	.007	-.094	.267	-.013
Father's Employment - Else[6]	-.201	1.056	-.013	.119	.226	.029
Father's Education - Elementary or less[7]	-.371	.818	-.028	-.069	.175	-.020
Family Integrity[8]	.379	1.516	.025	-.074	.325	-.026
Living Arrangements[9]	-.124	1.554	-.008	.016	.333	.005
Illness in Family	-.304	.976	-.022	-.046	.209	-.013
Constant	6.850	4.488	—	1.494	.962	—

1. For total convicted offenses F=2.94, $p < .001$, $R^2=.163$; for convictions F=4.25, $p < .001$, $R^2=.221$.
Both variables include outright convictions, convictions with release from punishment (extenuating circumstances, etc.), and verdicts of mental illness and retardation.

2-10. See parallel footnotes to Table 16.

* $p < .01$

Post-program convicted offenses or convictions are not presented here for two reasons. First, the pre-post distinction is less meaningful for these measures, as verdicts are often rendered a considerable time after the offense; at times, youths may be judged after program participation even though the offense had been perpetrated prior to their entry. Second, and more mundanely, the two measures yield approximately equivalent results.*

The findings for these two measures are quite straightforward, basically equivalent, and almost totally correspondent to those on post-program offense rates presented in Table 16. The single effect of background attributes (illness in family) has disappeared; males are more likely to accumulate both convictions and offenses followed by convictions than females; and youths who had participated in Youth Protection Agency programs are disproportionally extreme on both these measures.**

The final indicator of crime and delinquency to be examined here is the severity of the offenses perpetrated by the youth, and the severity of the verdict rendered by the courts. Both are coded in descending order, the former on an 11-point and the latter on a 5-point scale (see footnote 1 to Table 18 for detail). The most serious offense and verdict respectively are the dependent variables under consideration. The "severity of offense" variable may have been scaled too exactly, especially at its upper extreme

---

* Of course, pre-entry convicted offenses are entered here as an additional independent variable ($\beta = .274$). There is a slight improvement in the proportion of the variance explained by this model ($R = .187$). The same holds true for the number of convictions as a dependent variable.

** Note again that this is the case not only for the total number of convicted offenses and convictions, but for the corresponding post-program indices - controlling for pre-entry delinquency - as well.

(i.e., for less serious offenses); however, these are precisely the categories in which most offenses are concentrated.

Table 18 presents no surprises with respect to the second variable (most severe conviction): all the familiar patterns remain (girls suffer from less stiff sentences, while Youth Protection Agency inmates receive more severe verdicts). One new socioeconomic variable (father's education, which decreased the severity of verdicts) enters the equation for the first time. While any explanation for this effect would be post-hoc, it is conceivable that a process of "reverse discrimination" is evident here; that is, the juvenile courts may issue lighter sentences to more "disadvantaged" (at least in this respect) offenders. This interpretation would run counter to the evidence suggesting that the courts do not differentiate among defendants on the basis of social class (e.g., Chiricos & Waldo, 1975), and clearly contest other research indicating that lower social class offenders are stigmatized in this context (e.g., Chambliss, 1969; Chambliss & Seidman, 1971). Unfortunately, however, the current finding is not sufficiently potent (in terms of the size of the coefficient, or as being grounded in multiple components of SES) to substantiate any such claim. We note also that the total amount of variance explained by the model predicting the most severe conviction is less than satisfactory (the lowest explained variance of all dependent variables examined so far), so that this indicator is not well explained by either background characteristics or program categories.

The remaining dependent measure of delinquency - seriousness of offense - yields surprises only insofar as neither any of the independent variables nor the complete model have any predictive power. This may imply that even those programs that absorb and then reproduce the quantitatively most delinquent

Table 18. Regression Analyses of Rehabilitation Frameworks and Selected Background Characteristics on Most Serious Offense and Conviction[1]

Independent Variable	MOST SERIOUS OFFENSE			MOST SEVERE CONVICTION		
	Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)	Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)
Vocational Training[2]	-.602	1.413	-.032	.559	.593	.067
Youth Protection	.571	1.108	.044	-1.586	.465	-.274*
Unique Institutions	.631	1.183	.048	-.330	.497	-.057
Street Groups - Education	.181	.944	.022	-.093	.396	-.055
Street Groups - Social Affairs	-.025	1.156	-.002	-.276	.485	-.051
Girls in Distress	-.866	1.083	-.111	-.284	.455	-.082
Sex (Youth)[3]	-.456	.904	-.062	.781	.379	.238*
Father's Origin - Israel[4]	-.231	1.386	-.012	.049	.582	.006
Father's Origin - Asia/Africa	.535	.757	.052	.170	.318	.037
Father's Employment - Irregular[5]	-.737	1.204	-.039	.037	.506	.004
Father Unemployed	-.249	.758	-.023	-.324	.318	-.069
Father's Employment - Else[6]	-.020	.644	-.002	.120	.270	.031
Father's Education - Elementary or less[7]	.115	.499	.015	.464	.209	.141*
Family Integrity[8]	.041	.924	.005	-.277	.388	-.073
Living Arrangements[9]	-.302	.947	-.033	-.235	.398	-.059
Illness in Family	-.188	.595	.023	-.170	.250	-.048
Constant	3.009	2.736	—	2.252	1.149	—

1. Severity of offense is coded as follows: 1 - murder, manslaughter; 2 - assault; 3 - sexual offenses; 4 - robbery, burglary; 5 - drug-related offenses; 6 - threats and blackmailing; 7 - theft; 8 - unpermitted use of vehicle; 9 - offenses related to stolen goods; 10 - offenses against public welfare; 11 - miscellaneous offenses.
   Severity of verdict is coded as follows: 1 - conviction (including verdicts of mental illness and retardation); 2 - convictions without punishment (extenuating circumstances); 3 - unadjudicated files; 4 - closed files (lack of evidence or public interest, etc.); 5 - acquittals.
   For severity of offense $F < 1$, n.s.; for severity of conviction $F = 2.58$ $p < .001$, $R^2 = .146$.

2-9. See parallel footnotes to Table 16.

* $p < .05$.

population (i.e., those who have accumulated the most criminal records, the most convicted offenses, the most convictions, etc.), offer no evidence that inmates are qualitatively different offenders (i.e., that they engage in more serious crime). It is not easy to foresee what the implications of this distinction might be - either for the juvenile court system, or for the institutions themselves. We note finally, that the measures examined in Table 18 are not directly pertinent to program effectiveness, as they do not entail the earlier distinction between pre- and post-program indicators - mostly for technical reasons.

2. Military Performance

We now turn to our second group of indicators of post-program readjustment: the quality of the youths' military service. The measures under this heading may be subdivided into two categories: the IDF's inclination to draft the youth, given his or her observed potentials, motivation, background characteristics and past career; and various aspects of the youth's military performance, as measured and recorded by the IDF. In analyzing these data, we shall rely on the same regression models that served to predict the youths' delinquent patterns, but add the total number of criminal records (and in isolated cases, other indicators of delinquency) as an independent variable to the equation.

Table 19 presents the regression statistics for a model using recruitment (yes/no) as the dependent variable. This model entails a number of assumptions which may be debatable. First, it does not utilize information on the basic "quality measures" which serve as partial basis for the IDF's decision to recruit the youths. We opted to exclude these variables since much of their variance should be accounted for by some of the original

Table 19. Regression Analysis of Rehabilitation Frameworks, Delinquency and Selected Background Characteristics on Military Recruitment[1]

Independent Variable	RECRUITMENT (DUMMY VARIABLE) Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)
No. of offenses	.002	.028	.059
Vocational Training[2]	.148	.185	.058
Youth Protection	.453	.154	.258*
Unique Institutions	.177	.155	.101
Street Groups - Education	.186	.124	.172
Street Groups - Social Affairs	.159	.143	.151
Girls in Distress	.299	.152	.183*
Sex (Youth)[3]	.214	.122	.233*
Father's Origin - Israel[4]	.033	.182	.013
Father's Origin - Asia/ Africa	.224	.099	.016
Father's Employment - Irregular[5]	.073	.158	.029
Father Unemployed	.018	.099	.013
Father's Employment - Else[6]	-.003	.084	-.003
Father's Education-Elementary or less[7]	-.092	.065	-.093
Family Integrity[8]	-.021	.121	-.018
Living Arrangements[9]	.014	.124	.011
Illness in Family	.045	.078	.042
Constant	.860	.361	--

1. The variable of military recruitment is effect-coded, such that recruitment = 1, non-recruitment = 2. F = 1.54, n.s. for the regression.

2-9. See parallel footnotes to Table 16.

background variables (recorded by the rehabilitation program itself) which are part of the model. In other words, while we did find that youths from different frameworks differed on many IDF intake measures (e.g., ability groupings), these differences may well be accounted for by the variables included in the model (e.g., Table 19). A test of this assumption, conducted by entering military intake measures into the equation, tends to support it: the predictive power of the model increases (not that it does not reach significance in Table 19), but the basic pattern of beta-weights remains the same.

The second assumption underlying the model in Table 19 is that the number of criminal records, rather than some other index of delinquency, is the most appropriate predictor of military recruitment. The difficulty in deciding this issue is due to our lack of knowledge as to how the IDF weighs delinquency data in making recruitment decisions.* In any event, the findings in Table 19 fail to support the notion that the total number of criminal offenses committed by the youths serve as an independently meaningful criterion. When other measures of delinquency are substituted, only one - the most severe offense committed - reaches an acceptable level of significance ($\beta = -.131$, $p < .05$), indicating that offenders with more serious violations (but not with more offenses, more convictions, etc.) are likely to be rejected. These substitutions, however, alter neither the magnitude of the remaining coefficients, nor the significance of the overall model. In general, the failure of the various models tested to predict military recruitment is somewhat perplexing, and call for additional analysis.

---

* This is considered privileged information. Moreover, it is not reasonable to enter two or more measures of delinquency concomitantly into the equation, as these tend to be highly intercorrelated.

Two of the few findings that do appear in Table 19 are straightforward: in addition to the manifest tendency of the IDF to employ different and more stringent criteria in the recruitment of females - which is enunciated here in the significant effect of gender - we find that after controlling for various background characteristics and delinquency, ex-inmates of Youth Protection programs are most likely to be rejected by the IDF. The remaining coefficient - corresponding to the negative net effect of the Unit for Girls in Distress on recruitment rates - is more difficult to interpret, as membership in this program and sex are completely collinear. Note, moreover, that this present finding contradicts the results of our earlier comparison between programs and untreated youths (Table 15), where this unit produced a positive effect on recruitment rates. Given the multicollinearity problem in the present analysis and the fact that the augmentation of girls' recruitment is both the express objective and part of the rehabilitation method of this particular unit, we are inclined to dismiss the pertinent result of the extended regression analysis as spurious.

A relatively small number of recruits - too small to concern us presently - received early discharges from the IDF. The reasons for such discharges were highly diverse (medical, personal, family, IDF reorganization, etc.), and they were as likely to be initiated by the youths as by the army. However, early discharge is of some interest to us for an additional reason: if we assume a hypothetical situation of perfectly valid selection and self-selection processes during recruitment and in the case of early discharge, we would expect none of the variables examined so far - background characteristics, delinquency, and type of rehabilitation program - to affect other indicators of the quality of military service.

Table 20. Regression Analysis of Rehabilitation Frameworks, Delinquency and Selected Backgrounds Characteristics on Days of Desertion and Days in Military Jail[1]

	DAYS DESERTION			DAYS IN JAIL		
Independent Variable	Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)	Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (β)
No. of offenses	.055	.341	.011	-.010	.103	-.007
Vocational Training[2]	-3.183	22.825	-.010	1.175	6.917	.012
Youth Protection	-4.793	19.978	-.023	-3.089	5.751	-.047
Unique Institutions	15.126	19.115	.072	5.859	5.793	.089
Street Groups - Education	12.909	15.236	.099	3.904	4.617	.096
Street Groups - Social Affairs	12.649	18.667	.064	1.177	5.657	.026
Girls in Distress	-.970	17.624	-.008	-.153	5.341	-.004
Sex (Youth)[3]	-18.421	15.005	-.153	-9.054	4.547	-.242*
Father's Origin - Israel[4]	-1.268	22.378	-.004	1.304	6.782	.013
Father's Origin - Asia/ Africa	6.271	12.221	.037	.843	3.704	.016
Father's Employment - Irregular[5]	.506	19.441	.002	1.759	5.891	.019
Father Unemployed	7.377	12.242	.043	.613	3.710	.011
Father's Employment - Else[6]	2.565	10.391	.018	-.125	3.149	-.007
Father's Education - Elementary or less[7]	-4.428	8.052	-.037	-2.131	2.440	-.057
Family Integrity[8]	2.660	14.929	.019	.940	4.524	.022
Living Arrangements[9]	-1.453	15.292	-.010	.324	4.634	.007
Illness in Family	4.428	9.608	.034	-.024	2.912	-.001
Constant	27.456	44.411	—	18.311	13.459	—

1. None of the coefficients in the first equation (days of desertion) are significant, and the equation as a whole fails to explain a significant portion of the variance in days of desertion. The substitution of other delinquency-related measures (e.g., convicted offenses, most serious offense) does not alter this pattern. For the second equation (days in jail) only sex has a significant effect (females are incarcerated less; $F = 1.80$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .113$); this pattern is also not altered by the substitution of other delinquency variables.

2-9. See parallel footnotes to Table 16.

* $p < .05$.

The findings displayed in Table 20 reveal that this is indeed the case for at least two major indicators of military performance: the number of days the youth had spent outside his or her unit without permission, variations in this indicator of performance cannot be predicted by any of the independent variables or by the equation as a whole; and the number of days spent in military jails, which is affected only by gender - for the self-evident reason that females evince less disciplinary violations both in civilian and in military life, and are therefore less likely to be incarcerated. Substituting the number of desertions and the number of times in jail respectively, does not alter these (non)-findings. Thus, the various rehabilitation programs and institutions appear to have no impact on disciplinary problem-related patterns in the army - presumably due to earlier selection and self-selection processes which produced a more homogeneous population of recruits.

However, this is not necessarily the case for positive indicators of military performance - such as promotions (Table 21). Several effects - and particularly unique program effects - appear when we examine this variable. The range of ranks attained by this sample is, for self-evident reasons, more restricted than that in the general population; virtually no youths received an officer's commission. We encounter a total of four variables, three among them institution-related, that decrease the chances for military promotion: civilian delinquency prior to recruitment; the unique residential frameworks; and both Youth Advancement Units (but note - not Youth Protection Agency institutions).

These findings are odd, insofar as they do not conform to the emergent logic of the patterns delineated so far. It is not immediately evident why youths who had been delinquent in their civilian lives, should find it more

Table 21. Regression Analysis of Rehabilitation Frameworks, Delinquency and Selected Background Characteristics on Military Ranks[1]

Independent Variable	MILITARY RANK Unstandardized (B)	SE	Standardized (ß)
No. of offenses	-.018	.006	-.188**
Vocational Training[2]	-.014	.427	-.002
Youth Protection	-.365	.355	-.087
Unique Institutions	-.786	.358	-.187**
Street Groups - Education	-.631	.285	-.243**
Street Groups - Social Affairs	-.660	.350	-.168*
Girls in Distress	.058	.330	.023
Sex (Youth)[3]	.174	.281	.073
Father's Origin - Israel[4]	-.081	.419	-.013
Father's Origin - Asia/ Africa	-.025	.229	-.008
Father's Employment - Irregular[5]	.055	.364	.009
Father Unemployed	-.126	.229	-.037
Father's Employment - Else[6]	.076	.195	.027
Father's Education-Elementary or less[7]	.003	.151	.001
Family Integrity[8]	-.110	.280	-.040
Living Arrangements[9]	-.076	.286	-.026
Illness in Family	-.284	.180	-.110
Constant	3.092	.832	--

1. Ranks are coded as follows: Private = 1, Lance-Corporal, Corporal = 2, Sergeant and higher = 3. $F = 2.83$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .167$ for the complete model. Substitution of alternative delinquency measures does not alter the overall findings.

2-9. See parallel footnotes to Table 16.

difficult to receive promotions than non-delinquents - especially since the more extreme violators had already been selected out earlier by the IDF, and since disciplinary problems (Table 20) reveal no such effects. With respect to program effects, one could hypothesize that unstructured (Youth Advancement Units) and highly sheltered (unique institutions) frameworks might make adjustment to military life more difficult; but again, such difficulties should theoretically find outlets in disciplinary problems as well. However, given the variety of internal factors that may affect military promotions - manpower policies, types of units and military jobs, etc. - promotions may well not be the most representative indicator of military performance.

9. REHABILITATING DISATTACHED YOUTH: IN SEARCH OF ALTERNATIVES

Let us summarize briefly. This study was designed to examine a series of individual outcomes of adolescents who had dropped out from the education system and other normative frameworks (disattached youths). The outcomes of interest, while relatively short-term, are of greater external validity than variables usually scrutinized in this context, such as questionnaire responses or behavioral conformity within the institution or program. Here, we examined outcomes that correspond at least in part to the more extended rehabilitation objectives of advancement and social reintegration. Thus, the absence of post-program criminal involvement should be regarded as one of the most direct outcomes of successful rehabilitation; and the youth's recruitment and the quality of the ensuing military service are goals directly strived for by most programs, and prerequisites for attainment in many areas of civilian life in Israel. The extent to which these measures, taken within a period of up to two years after graduation, are valid indicators of subsequent achievement and adjustment must, however, remain an open question. At the very least, the outcomes examined here should pose a series of challenges to the rehabilitation system as it operates now, even if some will not be entirely satisfied with the principal conclusions which appear to follow from the present findings.

The study involves the largest and most systematic sample of disattached youths ever examined in this country, and perhaps elsewhere as well. The elements of the sampling procedure that remained unsystematic are due not to oversight, but to the inherent characteristics of this population and the system which absorbs them: difficulties in tracing and identifing individual youths, sloppy record keeping by programs and agencies, decision making (in particular about program recruitment) that is not clearly spelled out, etc. Since the rehabilitation system is under no obligation - save perhaps the principle of accountability - to provide data to social researchers, we may be in no position to fault it for deficient record keeping. I suspect, however, that the same inadequacies that plagued the sampling and the data collection procedures in this study are also disfunctional for the rehabilitation system itself.

All this should not blind us to the fact that the unsystematic referral of youths to different programs resulted in unsystematic sampling, and that the limited information available from participants' records increased the risk that outcome differences among programs may be due to unmeasured variations in population characteristics rather than (or in addition to) rehabilitation effects. This possibility undoubtly constitutes the most serious threat to the internal validity of this study; perhaps its most disturbing aspect is that it is an unavoidable risk, which can be rectified only by experimental designs.* However, as already noted, any criticism of the study, its findings and its conclusions must, by definition, make a series of rather far-fetched assumptions: namely, that the participant populations of different programs differ systematically on unmeasured characteristics; that these characteristics are uncorrelated with other individual attributes that were measured; and that these unmeasured characteristics affect program outcomes. On these grounds, it appears more likely to this observer that the findings are in fact internally valid, and not solely or primarily attributable to methodological problems. It may be noteworthy, in this context, that rehabilitation officials often provide a simple and ostensibly powerful explanation for the discrepancy between the recorded evidence (which suggests that population differences among the various programs reflect, at the very most, insignificant trends), and their own notion that such differences may be latent, but are certainly systematic and prevalent. The bridging argument is based on the existence of highly experienced "gatekeepers" at all levels of the rehabilitation system. These gatekeepers, on the basis of informal observations, interviews, and an inherent "sense" of these youths - based on many years of work with and exposure to this population - regulate the flow and selection of youths within the system. According to these officials, differences among youths selected into different programs are therefore real and valid, though based exclusively on an implicit rationale, and on the naive diagnostic skills of these gatekeepers.

---

* Which are both nonrealistic and unethical.

I find this line of reasoning only partially convincing. It may well be that highly experienced youth workers, who are familiar with both the population of disattached youths and the diverse rehabilitation programs, may employ selection criteria and standards which cannot be rationalized, but which are partly valid. However, even if this is the case, the rehabilitation system should make an effort to develop these naive notions into a full-blown diagnostic tool. As long as it fails to do so, the margin for error is immense, and the system itself is protected from any serious attempt to evaluate it - i.e., it remains unaccountable.

In addition to the large number of subjects who comprise a sample as systematic as possible, the present study also comprises the largest number of rehabilitation programs ever studied in Israel. In fact, only few frameworks are not implicated directly or indirectly by these comparisons. Moreover, while the present report analyzes categories or types of programs rather than the 56 studied units specifically - primarily due to statistical constraints - the Hebrew version to be published concurrently includes appendices which offer more detail. It is also more generally the case that the wealth of data collected cannot be summarized in its entirety in this report, so that future publications will hopefully expand the analysis further.

Let us first recapitulate our major findings, and then endeavor to draw some more generalized conclusions from this research. First, it is evident that the population of disattached youths is quite homogeneous in its patent characteristics (with some variations, as analyzed in Chapter 4), and that this homogeneity reflects exposure to particular social conditions and strata. These boys and girls originate from uniformly disadvantaged socioeconomic environments, in which individuals, family units and whole communities often fail to function adequely or normatively. Most parents had emigrated from Middle Eastern or North African countries, usually in the early 1950s, and parents' educational and occupational skills, as well as their value systems, undoubtedly made integration into modern Israeli society difficult at best. Most continue to suffer from these same educational disadvantages, many encounter repeated difficulties to find appropriate employment, and their economic and social status has suffered as well. In short, socioeconomic mobility, while perhaps not entirely absent, has been limited.

Yet, despite these difficulties, and despite the fact that most of these immigrants continue to reside in distressed neighbourhoods, most have established relatively large families, which they find difficult to support both financially and emotionally. These predicaments are hardly alleviated by the fact that many parents respond to their fate by a further reduced ability to function: absconding, family violence and abuse, criminal involvement, alcoholism, drug abuse, debilitating illness, and partial or total socio-emotional detachment within the family are frequent, and in some cases pervasive.

While we know only little about the social psychological mechanisms involved, it seems reasonable to assert that many youths who originate from such backgrounds and environments, which are also unlikely to produce appropriate role models either at home or in the community, are ill-equipped to cope with normative social institutions, and certainly with the all-important education system. The school itself, which should and to a certain extent does employ authority figures and projects to combat these tendencies, and to aid vulnerable youths via counselling, compensatory education, etc., may make some headway in ameliorating certain limited problems for some of these youths; but it is evidently unable to cope with either the magnitude or the profundity of this phenomenon, in terms of the number of pupils to be aided or the complexity of the issues involved. This inability ultimately produces some 16,000 to 21,000 youths, many still at the age of compulsory education, who have dropped out of the education system, and who are either unable or unwilling to return.

At this juncture of attrition, of course, the predicaments these youths encounter are multiplied and compounded by their repeated experience with failure at school and in almost any achievement task, by the continuing and perhaps cumulative impacts of malfunctioning families and communities, by the often deviant and non-normative use of leisure time (which dropout youths hardly lack), by the attitudes and behavior of the most significant peer groups, and by social stigma - to mention only some of the most crucial social processes involved. Consequently, any rehabilitation program designed for this population, regardless of its specific nature and attributes, should encounter considerable difficulties in even approaching these youths, not to mention its potential to reengage these boys and girls in normative educational, vocational, or other contexts.

To this we must add the delay in intake, often long after dropout has occurred, so that once acquired skills may already have been lost, deviant subcultures may have become more central to the youth, delinquent activities may have become more probable and frequent, and the general sense of alienation and disaffection may have increased even further. In essence, any institution or program which attempts to reengage youths at this juncture is charged not only with the inculcaton of more highly developed skills and capacities, but with the youth's complete resocialization, and with the internalization of the normative social system - all this while battling against frequent absconding, violence, etc., as well as against potent outside temptations.

What is implicit in these comments, then, is that the effectiveness of such programs in rehabilitating disattached youths should be viewed as a difficult task at best, while at the same time our society appropriates too few financial, manpower, educational and status resources, and while it may in any event be too late at this point to make any meaningful impression on the youths' subsequent careers.

And yet the present findings are, I suspect, rather disappointing in light of the research effort exerted, and - more importantly - in view of the probable aspirations of most programs studied. We discover that the programs differ somewhat with respect to a few patent background characteristics of participants at intake. The most striking differences occur with respect to criminal involvement, which is not surprising given that a significant portion of these programs are based on court referrals. The data lend only minimal support to the notion, however, that the distribution of youths among rehabilitation programs follows a rational trajectory, so that, for example, more "difficult" cases are referred to some institution rather than to others. The validity of this statement is contingent on the absence of unmeasured attributes that do differentiate among program populations; however, this constraint is in itself a contradiction in terms, since decisions about differential selection can hardly be made on the basis of unknown information.

The findings regarding the outcome (dependent) variables in this study are not easily summarized, as they involve several complex patterns and evince a certain degree of inconsistency. At face value, there is some indication of outcome differentiation among the various rehabilitation frameworks. We note in particular that before-after comparisons of delinquent activities suggest a relative decrease in the number of criminal records accumulated (e.g., in the Social Affairs Youth Advancement Units, the unique residential institutions, and the involuntary centers of the Youth Protection Agency) - which, however, did not consistently coincide with the relative number of delinquents (which, for example, increased in Youth Protection Agency centers). We also find that graduates of voluntary residential centers evince both higher recruitment rates and a lower probability of being rejected or discharged early by the IDF.

Unfortunately, however, even these limited outcome differentials disappear almost entirely in the more sophisticated regression models (Chapter 8) which simultaneously compare rehabilitation frameworks and control for selected background characteristics. It appears that these analyses do provide support for the hypothesis that "nothing works". Irrespective of which outcome variable is examined, what type of analysis is employed, or which statistical controls are introduced, there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that any type of rehabilitation program improves the performance of youths on any dimension.* We must once again refrain from over - generalizing; it is not inconceivable that more prolonged follow-up, examing civilian careers, would have produced more pronounced differences.**

Nonetheless, two facets of the findings are disturbing. First, the outcome similarities among youths from different programs are, as noted, completely consistent; if these programs would have had any impact, it should have been at least minimally discernable. Second, the only outcome difference which does occur with considerable consistency is negative - i.e., it reflects a debilitating effect of Youth Protection Agency institutions and programs on participants. Again, which this finding should not be overinterpreted for reasons cited above, it hardly enhances our confidence in the rehabilitation system.

---

* Note that this statement is valid for criminal involvement and military performance, but not necessary for the acquisition of various skills (e.g. educational, vocational) which many programs presumably inculcate. However, even if these aspects of resocialization are sucessful, they deal with symptoms rather than with the fundamental problem: the youth's rejection of social norms, authority and distributions. There is no evidence that any change occurs on these levels.

** For example, the level of delinquent activities is known to be on the increase in this age range, and to decrease thereafter - which may have produced a "ceiling effect". Similarly, there is no empirical support for the widely-accepted notion that the quality of military service is predictive of later civilian careers.

What are the more general deductions to be derived from these findings? This study was concerned with the question whether treatment and rehabilitation programs for disattached youths are effective in changing undesirable behavioral patterns, and in facilitating the youths' entry or rentry into normative social frameworks. Given this concern, it is reasonable to expect more than a theoretical interpretation of the present findings. In fact, answers to a series of policy-related questins are called for - even if these answers are delimited by the methodological and statistical constraints we have emphasized very carefully throughout this report.

Even the most innocuous inspection of the overall pattern of findings appears to indicate that the most general conclusion to be drawn from this study is that "nothing works"; in fact (and this is stated with all due caution), some programs even appear to be deleterious to the youth's short-term social career - and in particular to his or her tendency to perpetrate criminal offenses or to recidivate. Both these general conclusions tend to emerge irrespective of the vista we choose to take in regard to our data: whether we examine delinquency or military recruitment, which indicators of criminal involvement are selected, whether we compare these programs with the outcomes of a group of untreated youths or to one another, whether we are satisfied with pre-entry delinquency as the single control variable or opt to employ virtually all known and measured individual background attributes as covariates to arrive at estimates of "net" program effects. To the present observer, it is somewhat difficult to dismiss these consistent findings as due to one or the other methodological artifact. Moreover, the argument repeatedly offered by rehabilitation officials that youths in some programs differ from others in some unmeasured attribute which also affects both delinquency rates and some indicators of military performance seems, if not entirely far-fetched, at least unlikely. There exists, of course, one additional and more substantive claim that should not be dismissed outright - namely, that the outcome variables chosen for this study are not directly indicative of social reintegration and readjustment (i.e., long-term occupational, marital, community, etc. careers), and consequently of limited policy import. While this may be the case, one might have expected at least some impact on one of the most crucial dimensions of the youth's disfunctioning (delinquency), and on their adjustment to the one framework for which virtually all programs attempt to prepare them in one way or the other (the military). To find that these rehabilitation programs make no difference in those respects is sufficiently discouraging even without making completely unsubstantiated assumptions about the lack of correlation between short-and long-term treatment effects.

Troubling as all this may be, there are really few grounds to expect that things should have turned out much differently. In chapter 2 of this report, I have reviewed a series of studies - albeit most conducted in the U.S., and most on populations of delinquent rather than disattached youths - which consistently replicate our major findings (i.e., that "nothing works"; the implication that some programs may actually be harmful is, to the best of my knowledge, unique to the present study). Unfortunately, this literuate is more forthcoming with consistent empirical findings than with correspondingly consistent and cogent explanations. While it is evident that the existing rehabilitation programs for this population are unsuccessful in achieving their express purpose, it is less clear why this should be the case; and by implication, which type or types of programs might be more effective. I shall attempt to provide a few preliminary suggestions to this effect below.

Let us now return to the original question posed in this discussion; What are the potential policy implications of the present findings? One possible way of rephrasing this question in the context of the data we have examined here might be: given that there evidently are no treatments, institutions or programs which aid these youths in overcoming their dificiencies and in functioning adequately - should any public (or private, for that matter) funds be expended in supporting these effects? Are there not better ways of using these monies, be it in promoting social welfare programs that benefit different populations, or even in completely different areas which require attention and assistance?

These are extremely difficult and even tricky questions; but if I were to be bold enough to propose any answer, it would certainly not include the recommendation to close any of these programs and institutions; and my hesitancy to do so is not only due to the assessment that such a recommendation would never be carried out. Moreover, I would not even advise to close down the one program - Youth Protection Agency institutions - which has accumulated the most negative evidence in this study. I believe that as long as no feasible alternatives for the voluntary programs are developed, youths' participation in them is probably preferable to the absence of any program. At the very least, these programs will keep youths "off the streets", decrease the immediate risks of anti-social behavior, and teach them basic skills such as reading and writing - thus at least in the short run providing minimal shelter. On the other hand, involuntary programs - which are not easily defendable on the above grounds - operate under constraints which make their adequate functioning difficult at best. We must keep in mind that these programs and institutions operate under unique conditions, such as a relatively difficult population, and the fact that youth's residence there is coerced. It may well be that not only the treatment methods employed by these programs are ineffectual, but that the entire conception of coercing adolescents into any institutions require revision. There is little doubt that the involuntary commitment of any population to any type of institution, whatever its other virtues may be, is totally alien and unconducive to rehabilitation. The question remains whether the social control agencies are willing or able to develop an alternative to involuntary commitment.

Fortunately, we are not required to answer these difficult questions about the termination of these programs; they are phrased erroneously, and therefore lead to erroneous conclusions. The programs examined here represent only a partial focus of analysis; at the very core of the issue is the population of at least 16,000 disattached youths itself. Even from a completely utalitarian point of view - that is, desregarding for a moment the real individual needs and even suffering of these youngsters - there is little doubt that society is obligated to do something about this problem. After all, the ethnic and socio-economic origins of these youths predispose them to embark on a career of disattachment; the absence of a constructive societal response would only serve to perpetuate a condition of disadvantage and perhaps even discrimination that is ascribed more than it is attained. Moreover, few of us are bold enough to claim that the raw potential of these youths (i.e., before they have fallen victims to their disadvantaged environment) is substantively less than that of their brethren residing in the better part of town. If so, our society stands to loose skilled and creative manpower that is surely and sorely needed in all areas of social endeavor. And if the problem of wasted potential were not enough, the skills and creativity of this population are all too often channeled into destructive activities many of which cause great harm to innocent victims, and tie up the police, the courts, and the prison system.

It seems to me, in consequence, that if there is any disadvantaged or needy social group that deserves a considerable investment, it is the youths studied here. This statement is not necessarily meant to imply that efforts to rehabilitate disattached youths should take precedence over programs for other indigent populations; while I may personally believe so, I also realize that I have no case in promoting my own value judgements.

Moreoever, it is certainly the case here, as in many other programs designed to ameliorate social ills, that prevention is the best method of treatment. However, and also similar to other such programs, prevention is only in part achieved by individual treatment; much of the change required is social-structural, and we have neither the knowledge nor the means to initiate such change. There can be little doubt that it is primarily conditions of social inequality that predispose families and neighborhoods to disfunction, and individuals to occupy socioeconomic strata in which they are prevented from realizing their own potentials. Despite what we know about intergenerational upward mobility, these conditions are liable to affect these individuals' sons and daughters as well; and perhaps one of the most striking long-term impact is the one under and study here: the exclusion from normative social frameworks and careers. And yet, the type of social change advocated by this position is not easily applied to Israeli society, now or in the foreseeable future; in fact, there is little evidence that it has ever been applied successfully anywhere. This type of ideology also fails to offer any solution for the disadvantages suffered by those individuals who are part of the present, non-egalitarian structure.

A more psychologically oriented approach to preventation would advocate early intervention, perhaps at the origin of the socialization process within the family, or at the latest during the early phases of schooling. This approach is clearly more reality-based, and it has been tested: there are a number of early intervention programs involving both children and parents, both in Israel (e.g., Hippy) and elsewhere; and there exist even more substantial efforts to introduce tutoring, counselling, remedial education, etc., from the earliest stages of elementary school. Several of these projects have been found to be successful, although the size of the population of dropouts appears to indicate that either their effectiveness or their coverage are limited. Despite the variability among these programs, they share a single underlying precept: namely, that negative socialization patterns and practices should somehow be interrupted before the consequent cognitive, affective, behavioral and interactional disfunctions become ensconced. The inescapable implication is that later intervention efforts - such as those studied here - encounter difficult to change or even irreversible patterns.

The early intervention approach is one again difficult to reject; but as noted above, reality does not deal very gently with such projects. The sheer size of the disattached population, and the amount of work "left over" to the rehabilitation frameworks studied here, suggests that the dropping-out phenomenon is controlled only partially at best. Early intervention programs are either not efficient enough, or not implemented on a sufficiently broad scale to prevent attrition and disattachment. Thus, rehabilitation as discussed in this report, although it may be too little, too late, and far from successful, remains at this point a necessary "last-ditch effort" to reverse the career trajectories of these youths - who or well on their way to becoming unemployed, delinquent, socially disfunctining, and generally a burden on society. In other words, effective prevention of school-dropout and consequent anti-social careers is a largely hypothetical objective; in the interim, we still have to cope with an unknown but substantial portion of the adolescent population who have already done so. In short, we must continue to provide treatment and rehabilitation.

And yet, the reality of "nothing works", which has been reinforced in the present study, continues to stare into our faces. This coin seems to have three rather than two sides: a population in need; good individual and social reasons to provide aid; and the apparent absence of any method to do so effectively. I believe, however, that solutions to this predicament do exist; but let me warn the patient reader that we shall now proceed from the well-travelled road of empirically-based inference to the shady path of (albeit, I hope, informed) conjecture.*

As a first step, it may be worthwhile to ask ourselves what the emergent needs of this population are when they come to our attention as school dropouts at the age of 13 or later. In part, we may draw upon our knowledge of the youths' background characteristics and of the various phases of their adolescent careers, as they crystallize via the present data and perhaps earlier research and theorizing already presented in chapter 2. Needless to say, the thesis to be presented below relies on a series of generalizations, and as such may not be valid for each individual youth.

---

* However, those willing to contemplate conjecture but discounting the possiblity of treating this population effectively - either because anything other than prevention is too little too late, or because its predicament is somehow congenital - may also choose to sidestep the remainder of this chapter.

It would be almost a tautology to state that disattached youths originate from a socially disadvantaged background. Their origins are underpriviliged from virtually any perspective: their neighborhood or town of residence is listed among the more distressed areas in Israel; one-parent families are not rare, and even where the family unit is complete one or both parents are frequently not functioning adequately; living density is disproportionately high; both parents are usually undereducated and frequently under-or unemployed; siblings are often themselves dropouts or delinquents; etc. From many informed interviews we have conducted with youths in the course of this study we have learned (though cannot statistically demonstrate) that other and possible more serious problems often exist. Many youths, and particularly girls, had experienced labor and sexual exploitation by their families, some had been pushed toward delinquency and prostitution by parents or by siblings from a very early stage of their childhood; child beating appears to be common phenomenon; etc.

All these facts of life have potentially devastating implications with respect to the child's socialization experiences. We shall elaborate on two such major ramifications here; both are, in my view, important factors that contribute to the child's career of disattachment, and define two of his four major needs from treatment. These first two dimensions are intellectual impairment and emotional insecurity.*

---

* The dimensions to be discussed here are distinct only for analytic purposes. They eminate from overlapping environmental and social predicaments, and are themselves interrelated.

Intellectual impairment. There can be little doubt that the social environment described here is hardly conducive to intellectual development and achievement, if we use these terms in the broadest sense. Despite integration efforts at many levels, kindergardens, pre-schools and schools continue to be badly staffed or understaffed. Distressed neighborhoods frequently lack sufficient resources, motivation or manpower to maintain either a fully adequate education system or sufficiently developed extra-curricular activities to compensate for these defects. Moreover, as the child is likely to enter the school system with serious deficiencies (see below), and as most of his or her classmates are in a similar position, teachers should find it almost impossible to give their pupils the individual attention that migh ameliorate such problems at an early stage.

The lack of adequate resources in the neighborhood schools, and the large body of pupils requiring special treatment are probably only a minor part of the process leading to intellectual impairment; as is often the case, the problem begins at home. It is not only the community which often lacks the basic required resources to promote the youth's development, but the nuclear family as well. While the cases in which youths are actively prevented by their parents to obtain a full education are probably rare (e.g., as in the examples of exploitation cited above), other indigenous problems persist. In many homes, youths lack the basic physical necessities for their continued intellectual stimulation and growth (space, educational toys, books and writing materials, etc.); parents often have neither the motivation nor the capacity - due to their socio-cultural background, their limited education, everyday pressures and frequent absences - to aid their child in intellectual tasks or to obtain outside help if necessary; neither do older siblings. It is also unlikely that the youth will find many positive role models in his nuclear family, who might steer him toward a fuller cultivation of his potential.

These and other community and family - related processes take place even prior to the youth's entry into the formal education system. Some are preventable via remedial measures, others - as alredy noted above - require the kind of structural change that is not yet on the horizon. While it is difficult to be specific about the micro-level connections between these social processes and psychological development, there can be little doubt that some of the most adverse intellectual characteristics usually attributed to marginal and delinquent youths - such as their inability to delay gratification, a limited span of attention, the absence of rational planning and future perspective - that these may be traceable directly to notious early socialization experiences. Moreoever, these same characteristics, together with the community and family processes analyzed above, are likely to prevent the child from becoming an effective learner. In a very significant sense, these children suffer from an a priori handicap from their first day in school; and the education system has neither the resources nor the manpower to cope effectively with this handicap - particularly not when it is wide-spread as in some neighborhood schools.* Very quickly, it becomes evident to all parties involved that the child fails to live up to educational standards and to teacher expectations; he continues to fall behind, and the familiar cycle of self-fulfilling prophesies is initiated; and ultimately, as a most crucial stepping stone toward a career of disattachment, he comes to despise and remove himself from anything related to formal education: teachers, the prevalent methods of teaching, the educational material, schools, the bueaucracy surrounding all of the above, etc.* In this sense, it is perhaps both surprizing and to the credit of the educational system that so few youths from among this disadvantaged sector of the population ultimately do drop out, and that they tend to do so in larger numbers only after the age of 15.

---

* Similarly handicapped classmates, and later similarly inclined youth groups and gangs are another significant factor that enters into the formation of disattached careers. We shall return to this issue below.

At the risk of drawing premature inferences, let us attempt to draw a preliminary profile of our population. We are dealing with children from uniformly disadvantaged economic and social background, with frequent functional and psychological disruptive patterns in their nuclear families. These children are sometimes abused and exploited, and more often than not disregarded and rejected by their families. The ensuing dynamics put them at a severe disadvantage at school, which may later culminate in complete dropout. The potential candidate for rehabilitative intervention, then, is an adolescent boy or girl who is alienated from the traditional schooling system, has neither the motiviation nor the capacity to reenter it, and in the prolonged process of dropout (starting with temporary absences) is far behind his or her age cohort in intellectual development and knowledge (e.g., the substantial rate of functional illiterary in this population). This is only one (albeit significant) set of problems that plague this segment of youths; it is raised here in more detail as all these problems have relatively clear-out implications for the rehabilitation system. From the point of view of intellectual development, this implies that rehabilitation and treatment means, among other things, to restart the youth at his own current level of ability; to carry his own potential as far as it can possibly go;* and to refrain from rewrapping the methods of formal education in different paper. We will return to these points in our model of effective treatment programs to be sketched at the end of this chapter.

---

* As we shall see below, he does not as easily dismiss the status attainment objectives of education. This, in fact, is one of the few remaining normative constraints that make intervention possible.

Emotional insecurity. So far we have emphasized the ramifications of the early socialization experiences of this population on educational achievements and careers. One has to be no sage to recognize that these same experiences, and in particular the disfunctional structure and dynamics of the youths' underpriviliged nuclear families, may have significant and long-lasting impacts as well. I am not a psychologist by training or by inclination; but a few general observations may well be in order.

Anyone who has ever worked with disattached youths in a more or less structured program (i.e., where there is at least constant and frequent interaction between staff and participants), must surely recognize the following two scenarios:

1. A youth who usually functions adequately starts to evince disruptive behavior, a sharp decline in performance, or even drops out of the program. After some prodding it is discovered that this deterioration is correlated with a severely disruptive family event: an alcoholic father may have returned home (or a healthy father may have abandoned home, for that matter), a brother may have been "busted" for armed robbery or a sister for

---

* Which may be as much as university studies, as one of the programs studied indicates; or as little as a shop apprenticeship, if this is what corresponds to the youth's motivation and ability.

prostitution, the youth himself may have been induced to partake in a criminal act, the youth or his siblings may have been sexually or physically abused at home, the family's economic condition may have deteriorated, etc.; the list is endless. The program may or may not have the capacity to cope with such problems either at the level of family intervention or at the level of the individual youth - though I suspect that many programs in fact lack such a capacity. The point is that these are not the problems prevalent among the average high school population - not in severity, nor in frequency or repeatability, nor in the proportion of the population affected at any time. Consequently, a modus operandus must be found whereby the program is able to cope with such problems on a continuous, rational and effective level.* Unless such a treatment component in fact exists in the rehabilitation program, whatever educational and intellectual gains have been made in the course of the youth's participation may be countermanded.

2. Our second scenario is undoubtedly equally well-known. It is a very common observation that program participants, especially shortly after intake and during the troublesome and regressive periods covered in scenario 1, relate to their counsellors and other treatment personnel in an almost dialectical fashion. On the one hand, the counsellor is a figure of formal and external authority to be wary of, to cooperate as little as possible with, and to exclude. On the other hand, this same counsellor is someone to look up to, to emulate, perhaps to admire and trust - in short, a hopefully positive

---

* This does not necessarily imply that individual treatment must be provided to each youth, or that any type of "in-depth analysis" is called for. Group methods and behavioral techniques may often suffice.

role model.* The psychological sources of this dialectic seem obvious - it expresses the constant dilemma between external authority and individual needs, between trust and distrust, between the adolescent and the adult world, between the youth's own subcultural values and priorities and those more widely accepted and adhered to; perhaps ultimately, it is the youth's attempt to find a father (or mother) substitute.

Now, these are by and large truisms which are known to and accepted by most rehabilitation programs; the widespread employment of youth counsellors and equivalent functions is predicated on similar assumptions regarding the social psychological import of this role in participants' lives. However, I would submit that the appropriate conceptualization and its effective translation into practice are still amiss. Given the counsellor's crucial role in the youth's psychological and emotional development, is suitable and sufficient manpower attracted? Are these individuals adequately trained? Are they given enough resources and time to cope with youths' problems? Are they sufficiently familiar with youths' background and families to intervene effectively? Is their performance monitored?

The answer to this and similar questions is a qualified yes in some cases, and an unfortunate no in many others. Again, the point here is not to make specific recommendations regarding any single type of rehabilitation program that might prove effective. Rather, I wish to emphasise that to the extent that such a program has to reengage participants in an education process that would permit them to bring their potentials to fruition, it is similarly crucial to attend to their emotional needs. The absence of any one of these two components (as well as of the others to be reviewed below) would probably render the most well-intended effort futile.

---

* In the best of cases, the counsellor may fulfill a third role - that of a friend.

Social support. Over 50 years of sociological and social psychological research have established quite convincingly that our immediate social environment, and particularly our peers, exert a significant influence on our thoughts, feelings and behaviors. This is especially true during the formative years of adolescence, when peer groups often come to occupy many of the socialization functions of the nuclear family, and tend to become the most meaningful group of reference in the youth's life space. More often than not, this may be regarded as a beneficial process; but in the experience of many disattached youths, peer groups exert a negative influence, since they tend to reinforce prevailing patterns of alienation, truancy, anti-normative subcultures, and various forms of anti-social behavior. These adverse influences reinforce already preexisting patterns established by family members and by older age cohorts in the neighborhood, and are in turn reinforced by them. In the face of such peer group pressures, any attempt at rehabilitation and treatment is risky at best, and impossible in the worst cases.

Most rehabilitation officials, staff and program administors are fully cognizant of the dangers of the non-conformist peer groups and of subcultures which dominate the youth's neighborhood; this does not necessarily means, however, that they know how to cope with the resultant problems. Some types of community programs - also represented by a few of the Youth Advancement Units in this study - rely on the existence of such groups or gangs for recruitment, and continue to do so despite considerable criticism. Whatever the drawbacks of this method may be, one must admit that the idea of shifting the unit of treatment from the individual youth to his peer group as a whole is, at the very least, intriguing. However, there is no evidence, either in the present study or elsewhere, that this conception is any more effective than other modes of treatment.

Perhaps the most obvious and radical method of reacting to the potentially disruptive influence of the youth's peer group on his advancement is to remove him physically from his original social environment. As noted earlier in this report, this mode of institutional education and rehabilitation is particularly prevalent in Israel, although it is not necessarily or even predominantly based on the notion of separating between the youth and his peers.*

The institutional alternative is not only radical and obvious, but also potentially powerful in more than one way. Residential centers are undoubtedly potent socialization and resocialization environments, a feature which is due at least in part to their ability to sever the youth's relations with disruptive community forces, and to their capacity to neutralize or at least minimize disruptions from within the institution. But all this potency is accompanied by distinct risks: the best institutions are in the constant danger of beoming detached refuges - "hothouses" after which graduating youths, not unlike removed plants, find it difficult to adjust to outside realities. Relying once again on sociological analysis, youths in such institutions learn to cope with internal demands under conditions of extended support systems; but they do not necessarily learn how to manage conflict, competition, external demands, etc. in the "real world". Under the worst scenario, these centers represent Goffman's (1957) notion of "total institution" in its extreme: a place that obliterates the inmate's sense of individuality and privacy, depresses his expressions of selfhood, and often leads to even greater alienation, and hatred and behavioral disturbances than the system (e.g., schools) that rejected the youth in the first place. I suspect that one type of program studied here - Youth Protection Agency institutions - comes dangerously close to this prototype of total institutions.

---

* Parents' fragile economic, emotional and social condition, the youth's special need for emotional and other support, and the removal of disruptive elements from society are among the other prevalent rationales of institutionalization.

Most institutions undoubtedly fall in - between these two extremes. However, there is no tested method to ensure the youth's preparation for the "outside world", while at the same time avoiding the risks of institutionalization. This does not mean that residential rehabilitation centers are necessarily unqualified to perform this task; it does mean that serious risks are involved, and that these risks make it worthwhile to examine alternatives. The basic question is whether it is possible to disassociate the youth from the disruptive influence of his peer group without removing him physically from his home and neighborhood, and without creating a total environment. The answer, I believe, is a qualified yes, provided that positive peer group and role model alternatives are created within the context of the rehabilitation program. Again, we shall have more to say about this toward the end of this chapter.

Opportunity structures. The principal objective of any treatment and rehabilitation program for disattached youths is to aid their reentry into the normative social system. One component of this system, and certainly not a marginal one, is the labor market. It follows that these programs are charged, among other things, to prepare participants either for the labor market itself, or for formal education and training programs that certify graduates for a profession. There are at least four basic requirements for an adequate preparation for the labor market or for vocational courses: the inculcation of appropriate work values and habits; the transmission of basic and more advanced skills (e.g., language proficiency, fundamental aspects of modern technology, etc.); acquaintance with the relevant portion of the actual labor market (e.g., industrial plants); and active aid in the transition from the protected environment of the program into, e.g., that of vocational training with agemates who are not similarly disadvantaged.

All this may look simple, but it is not. To the best of my knowledge, there is not a single program among those studied that meets all these requirements; some fail completely in this respect. The difficulty lies not only with the translation of these principles into practice, but also with some of the basic assumptions our society as a whole (and consequently also the rehabilitation system) hold about these youths.

We have noted earlier that disattached youths, as a result of a series of experiences and conditions, lack the ability to gain adequate achievements in the formal education system. Since we live in a society in which formal credentials are imperative to attainment (socially and in particular occupationally), it appears that "falling behind" and "dropping out" preclude most normative accomplishments in the labor market. At face value, and assuming that most youths do not possess the motivation to force themselves back into the system, three principal options remain: to remain outside the labor market or to do seasonal work, which perpetuates the youth's marginality and leaves him in the position of becoming the second or even third generation of hardship; to find illegal means of subsistance, which has obvious and severe implications for both the individual and society; and to become a minor entrepreneur, which may be a reasonable path toward attainment and income, but is relatively rare and does not necessarily correspond to the youth's potential.

The youth's potential, in addition to his aspirations (at least those that are realistic) are really at the core of this matter. The youth's intellectual and emotional development may be stunted by his background; but there is little doubt that his educational and vocational aspirations remain closely tied to those of the general population (e.g., Gottlieb, 1985 for evidence; Merton's (1957) distinction between means and ends is certainly relevant here); and there must be some doubt that the youth's current (lack of) achievements is totally determinate of his future ability to achieve under more benign circumstances. In other words, it is questionable whether the youth's present condition is necessarily indicative of his real potential.

I believe that the failure to comprehened the implications of the gap between what the youth has achieved and what he can achieve is one of the principal failures of the rehabilitation system. We would hardly expect a 16-year old, functionally illiterate, emotionally and behaviorally disturbed dropout adolescent to embark on a career of neuro-surgery, or to become a university professor. However, we do expect many of these youths to have the potential of retracing some of their missteps, and to gain certification to enter a relatively prestigious (certainly compared to their background), well-remunerated, statisfying profession. These occupations are thought of as belonging to the primary labor market - as opposed to secondary labor market jobs (e.g., Freedman, 1976; Doeringer & Piore, 1971) which are underpaid, lack avenues of advancement and tenure, entail environmental risks, etc.

It is an unfortunate fact that most rehabilitation programs do not diagnose the vocational capacities and preferences of participants, and do not provide meaningful and certified training or prepare the youth to enter such training. If they do provide such preparatory courses, they are usually directed at producing "water bearers and woodcutters" who may anticipate a life-long career in the secondary labor market. The failure to diagnose the youth's potential and then support and assist him in realizing it is, in my opinion, a crucial factor in the overall failure of these programs. If rehabilitation programs fail to foster the youth's recognition and attainment of his aspirations in such a central area of life as work careers - and these aspirations are one of the few remaining links between the youth and the normative social structure - there is little reason to expect that he will take the program seriously, or that the program will induce real and long-lasting change.

Requirements from an effective rehabilitation program. It is quite conceivable that many readers, more experienced in day-to-day work with disattached youths than I can claim to be, will find the preceding analytic discussion amiss. I would prefer to view this discussion as a preliminary basis for evaluating and changing existent programs, and perhaps as prefatory guideline for the planning of new ones - rather than as a fully integrated theoretical or explanatory system. Nonetheless, it may be worthwhile to devote the remainder of this chapter to an examination of some of the practical implications of the preceding discussion.

In considering the promotion of youths intellectual development, we should probably be concerned with style (or method) as well as with substance. The issue of the knowledge that should be transmitted (i.e., substance) is in part a simple one: as many of these youths have either not acquired or already forfeited basic knowledge in areas such as reading, writing and arithmetic, and as there can be little doubt that these are fundamental requirements for advancement in any further academic studies or for the preparation for and entry into most jobs, deficiencies in these areas must be compensated for. Beyond this obvious point, however, things are open to debate. Given that relatively a short-term rehabilitation program, commencing in the midst of adolescence, can hardly be expected to compensate for all the subjects in the average high school curriculum, and assuming that this may not be necessary or relevant for most youths who will shortly look for vocational certification rather than for high school diplomas, a series of rational choices have to be made. A clear pedagogic conception of what the prevailing needs of this population are and how to meet them are a natural prerequisite for such choices; and I doubt that most rehabilitation programs are presently driven by such a conception.

I prefer to leave the development of such a conception to experts greater than myself; but we may propose three general principles that should guide the development of a leaning cirriculum for disattached youths. First, many of these adolescents lack fundamental skills required to interact with their immediate and extended environment - getting on the right bus, negotiating with a government clerk, filling out a job application, knowing anything about the prevention of pregnancy, understanding their country's geography, political and social system, etc. Compensating for these deficiencies is as critical as teaching reading and writing skills. Second, and granted that most of these youths will enter the labor market within one or two years, basic training in modern technology seems to be called for. Third - and this is more clearly related to the treatment component of the program - the curriculum should foster creative and constructive self-expression - via music, art, creative workshops, volunteer activities, etc. Beyond these general tenets, curriculum development may well have to be tailored to the specific needs of individual youths.

As noted, promotion of the intellectual development of this population may be contingent on style as much as on substance. One of the principal failures of the school system from which these youths have dropped out is the total lack of concordance between their inclinations and the dominant methods of teaching - and in particular, frontal instruction to large classes, and the implicit or explicit element of competition. It stands to reason that youths who have distanced themselves from these methods will refuse to expose themselves again; and if they do, that they will experience repeated failure.

There is little doubt that frontal instruction and a highly competitive environment are not conducive to the learning process of most groups; and yet, there is no obvious alternative. As a preliminary suggestion, consider the advantages of computerized learning.* The use of computers in the learning process has at least five advantages that are of particular importance for the population examined here: It serves as a temptation for the youth to "try again", especially when the computer is introduced carefully and gradually so as to prevent anxiety; it serves as a status symbol, which differentiates the youth from his peers, and also may motivate some to join the program; it facilitates individual instruction methods through which many of the relevant taks (e.g., checking answers, introducing the next stage) are transferred from the overworked teacher to a machine; it provides instantaneous gratification, reinforcement and feedback, a feature which is tailored precisely to this population's needs; and it permits progress at an individual pace, with virtually endless possibilities of repeat performance and "branching" into subsidiary tasks - which removes the element of competition. Computers also have a number of disadvantages - not the least of which is their cost - but the principles which justify their use are, I believe, valid as a rule.

---

* The idea of using personal computers to facilitate the learning process of disattached youths was originally developed in the course of a novel project to serve this population, initiated by the JDC. The use of computers for these purposes is certainly not the only feasible alternative. It does, however, demonstrate quite clearly what the basic prerequisites of an effective learning process are. Several of the other proposition to be discussed below are also a product of the JDC planning and development team of which I am a member.

In sum, what is suggested here is that curricula for programs serving disattached youths should be based on methods that motivate them to reinitiate their studies and which keep their interest, and on contents that are relevant to their specific needs. It may or may not be the case that in the long run more remote topics for study and more traditional methods of learning can be introduced.

I have already disclaimed specific knowledge of treatment requirements and methods that may suit the needs and problems of this population. However, beyond the self-evident point that such treatment should avoid psychoanalytic-type methods and rely instead on techniques which ensure both rapid and lasting attitudinal and behavioral change, two additional points deserve mention; both combine two of the central program dimensions (treatment and social support) raised in the earlier discussion.

I suspect that most extant rehabilitation programs underestimate the importance of the youth's social environment in facilitating or (probably more often) preventing his progress. If this accusation is false in theory, it is certainly applicable in practice; and this aspect is certainly amiss in community programs which engage participants for a limited number of hours and discharge them back into their homes and communities.

The two most crucial agents in the adolescent's life at this stage are his family and his peer group. If the program is residentially - based, the peer group's influence may or may not diminish; problems related to the youth's relations with his family are most certainly "imported" into the institution, and will continue to impede effective rehabilitation. These problems are likely to multiply in the community, where participants continue to reside with their families and to "hang out" with their friends.

One conceivable (and probably prevalent) reaction to these concerns might be that most programs are neither charged with nor able to treat anyone but the individual participant; therefore, the most that may be expected from program staff is to discuss these issues with the youth, perhaps to invite parents once or twice a year to get acquainted, and in the most extreme cases to perform sporadic home visits or to refer family members to other social service agencies. These methods are relatively effortless, but in all probability also futile; and the notion that no realistic alternatives are available is disputable.

There now exist a number of techniques of family therapy which concentrate on the diagnosis and treatment of structural and interactional problems within the family unit - all this in the course of relatively short-term contact (e.g., Minuchin, 1974; Minuchin & Fishman, 1981). Many of these techniques concentrate on one focal family member (i.e., the youth in our case), in an attempt to resolve crisis situations that specifically affect his functioning. These methods have even produced documented achievements with lower-class families in slum areas (Minuchin et al., 1967). While it is not entirely clear whether these techniques can be applied on a large - scale basis (e.g., limitations of trained manpower, cost, etc.), a number of Israeli therapists are well-versed in them and should be consulted.

The problem of neutralizing the harmful influence of peer groups is perhaps more elusive, but not necessary insolvable. The basic challenge is to create an alternative to the youth's membership in such groups; the most natural solution appears to be to create and then reinforce such an alternative via the group of peers within the program itself. If the program as a whole is successful, and if counsellors manage to gain some control over the group's structure, leadership, interactions and activities, it is not unlikely that such a group will develop alternative norms and commitments, and become a positive substitute for the neighborhood gang. It may even become the peer group with which the youth will associate outside the framwork of the program as well. Moreover, concentration on group-centered activities may have additional therapeutic value which could not be realized otherwise.

Finally, let us examine the implications of the notion of "opportunity structures". As our target population is several lengths behind everyone else in realizing its potential and in exploiting relevant and real social opportunities, any rehabilitation program will have to do more than advancing participants to a minimal level of proficiency, and then sending them out to care for themselves. Beyond the basic requirements of intellectual development discussed above, any real attempt to improve the youth's social and occupational opportunities should probably entail the following ingredients: (1) an advanced diagnostic system to delineate the youth's academic potential and vocational inclinations and skills; (2) an education and training program that is geared toward realizing the youth's potential. As no rehabilitation program can possibly operate the whole range of academic and vocational courses necessary to complement participants' needs, measures should be taken to ensure that they acquire the necessary skills and habits to enter other schools, courses, etc. - rather than providing them with minimal and usually terminal training for low-level occupations, as is the case now in most programs; (3) active assistance in the youth's search for schooling, vocational training or a job following his graduation from the program; this may require formal institutional arrangements with schools and industry; and (4) follow-up of the youth's success in adjusting to these normative frameworks.

It may well be that the elements of an ideal rehabilitation program for disattached youths' outlined here are unattainable in the short run, either in their entirety or even in part. It is an unfortunate fact that all existing rehabilitation programs operate under serious constraints of funding and a lack of trained manpower, which render the implementation of these principles difficult at best. On the other hand, it is also evident that many of these programs tend to function on the basis of inertia, resisting meaningful change even in the face of failure, and making little of any use of the more recent knowledge accumulated in the Social Sciences. I suspect that the discouraging findings from the present study are attributable less to the irreversibility of the adverse careers of this group of adolescents, or even to the presumed methodological deficiencies of this research. Rather, this study joins a considerable line of research which proves virtually all types of rehabilitation programs for this population to be ineffective. Most of these programs, and certainly nearly all of those examined here, have failed to implement the rather common-sensical but basic suggestions presented in this chapter. I hope that this document will at least serve to provoke discussion, and to raise our awareness of these youths' plight, of its social implications, and of the pragmatic possibilities of changing this reality by planned and multi-level intervention.

REFERENCES

Adams, S.

1967 Some findings from correctional caseload. Federal Probation, 31, 48-57.

Adler, C.

1980 Report of the Committee for Education and Care Alternatives for Youth who have Dropped out of Educational and Vocational Training Frameworks. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Akers, R.L. & M.D. Krohn

1979 Social learning and deviant behavior: A specific test of a general theory. American Sociological Review, 44, 635-655.

Alker, H.R.

1969 A typology of ecological fallacies, in M. Dogan & S. Rokkan (eds.), Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Allison, P.D.

1985 Event History Analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Arieli, M. & Y. Kashti

1976 Residential settings as social organization, in Y. Kashti & M. Arieli (eds.), Residential Settings: Socialization in Powerful Environments. Tel Aviv: Daga.

Arieli, M., Y. Kashti & S. Shlasky

1981 Away from Home: Israeli Residential Schools as People-Processing Organizations. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, School of Education.

Aviel, A.

1977 Youth Clubs and Street Groups: Structure and Interaction. Tel-Aviv: Institute of Social Research.

Becker, H.S.

1977 Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: McMillan (revised edition).

Begab, M.

1980 Value and disadvantages of residential care for disadvantaged youth, in S. Adiel, C. Shalom & M. Arieli (eds.), The Rehabilitation of Youth in Distress and Residential Education. Tel-Aviv: Cherikover.

Bidwell, C.E.

1981 Residential settings as administered communities: Some observations on analytic dimensions and precipitating conditions, in R. Shapira & C. Adler (eds.), Report of the Israeli-American Seminar on Out-of-School Education. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Blalock, H.M.

1964 Causal Inferences in Non-Experimental Research. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Burstein, L.

1985 Units of analysis , in T. Husen & T.N. Postlethwaite (eds.), The International Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 9 (T-Z). New York: Pergamon Press.

Burstein, L.

1978 Assessing differences between grouped and individual-level regression coefficients. Sociological Methods and Research, 7, 5-28.

Burstein, L., R.I. Linn & F.J. Capell

1978 Analyzing multilevel data in the presence of heterogeneous within - class regressions. Journal of Educational Statistics, 3, 347-383.

Chambliss, W.J.

1969 Crime and the Legal Process. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chambliss, W.J. & R.B. Seidman

1971 Law, Order and Power. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Chiricos, T.G. & G.P. Waldo

1975 Socioeconomic status and criminal sentencing: an empirical assessment of a conflict proposition. American Sociological Review, 40, 753-772.

Central Bureau of Statistics

1983 Israel Statistical Yearbook. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture.

1979 Israel Statistical Yearbook. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Clinard, M.B.

1974 Sociology of Deviant Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston (4th ed.).

Cloward, R. & L.E. Ohlin

1960 Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, A.K.

1955 Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, E.

1983 Ethnicity and legitimation in contemporary Israel. Jerusalem Quarterly, 28, 111-124.

Cook, P.J.

1975 The correctional carrot: better jobs for parolees. Policy Analysis, 1, 11-54.

Cronbach, L.J.

1976 Research on Classrooms and Schools: Formulation of Questions, Design and Analysis. Stanford: Stanford Evaluation Consortium.

Cronbach, L.J., & N. Webb

1975 Between-class and within-class effects in a reported aptitude and treatment interaction: reanalysis of a study by G.L. Anderson. Journal of Educational Psychology 67, 717-724.

Court-Brown, W.M.

1968 Males with a xyy sex chromosome complement. Journal of Medical Genetics, 5, 325-327.

Dery, D.

1981 Definitions of youth in distress: data that should arouse questions. Mifgash, 3, 17-21.

1979 Youth Who Do Not Learn or Work: Analysis of the Problem and Recommendations for Improvement. Jerusalem: Prime Minister's Office.

Doeringer, P. & M. Piore

1971 Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis. Lexington: Heath.

Druck, C., and C. Adler

1984 Survey of Educational Action Programs and Evaluation Studies. Jerusalem: NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education.

Egozi,

1978 The Socioeconomic Structure of Settlements and Statistical Areas in Israel (according to the 1972 Population Survey). Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture, Department of Planning.

Elliott, D. Delinquency and perceived opportunity. Sociological Inquiry, 32, 216-227.

Erikson, E.E.

1959 Identity and the Life-Cycle. International Universities Press.

Feuerstein,

1971 The redevelopment of the socio-culturally disadvantaged in group care, in M. Wolins & M. Gottesman (eds.), Group Care: An Israeli Approach. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Freedman, M.

1976 Labor Markets: Segmentation and Shelters. New York: Universe.

Garrett, C.J.

1984 The efficacy of treatment for adjudicated delinquents: A meta-analysis. Annual Meetings of the American Society of Criminology, Cincinnati.

Giallombardo, R.

1982 Female delinquency, in R. Giallombardo (ed.), Juvenile Delinquency: A Book of Readings. New York: Wiley (4th ed.).

Glass, G.V., B. McGraw & M.L. Smith

1981 Meta-Analysis in Social Research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Glueck, S. & E. Glueck

1970 Toward a Typology of Juvenile Offenders. Grune & Stratten.

Goffman, E.

1957 Characteristics of total institutions, in S. Dinitz, R. Dynes & A. Clarke (eds.), Studies in the Process of Stigmatization and Societal Reaction. Oxford University Press.

Goldberg, H.E.

1984 Green Town's Youth: Disadvantaged Youth in a Development Town in Israel. The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, Assen.

Goodman, L.A.

1959 Some alternatives to ecological correlation. American Journal of Sociology, 64, 610-625.

Gottlieb, A.

in press,a Second generation immigrant youth in Israel: how do they fare? in M. Gottesman (ed.), Educational and Cultural Transition in Israel.

in press,b Interfaces between residential school, family, and community: an analysis of relevant issues, in Y. Kashti & M. Arieli (eds.), Residential Settings and the Community: Congruence and Conflict.

in press,c Organizational patterns in institutions for the rehabilitation of disattached youth. Delinquency and Social Deviance.

Gottlieb, A.

1985a Work Groups in Project Renewal: A Comprehensive Report. Tel-Aviv: Institute for Social Research, Tel-Aviv University.

1985b Rehabilitating disattached youth in residential centers: problems and prospects, in Y. Kashti & M. Arieli (eds.), People in Institutions: The Israeli Scene. London: Freund.

1983 The Rehabilitation of Marginal Youth in Residential Frameworks: A Case Study of Manof and Kedma. Jerusalem: NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education.

Gottlieb, A. & Y. Guy

1984 Work Groups in Project Renewal: A Research Collection. Tel-Aviv: Institute for Social Research, Tel-Aviv University.

Gottlieb, A. & I. Piliavin

1982 Temporary employment and crime: the effects of subsidized work programs on offenders and juvenile delinquents. Social Problems, 30, 244-251.

Hannan, M.T., & L. Burstein

1974 Estimation from grouped observations. American Socological Review, 39, 374-382.

Hannan, M.T. & N.B. Tuma

1978 Methods of temporal analysis. Annual Review of Sociology, 5, 303-328.

Haney, W.

1980 Units and levels of analysis in large-scale evaluation, in K. Roberts & L. Burstein (eds.), New Directions in Methodology of Social and Behavioral Sciences. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hindelang, M., T. Hirschi & J. Weiss

1981 Measuring Delinquency. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hirschi, T.

1980 Labeling theory and juvenile delinquency: an assessment of the evidence, in W.R. Gove (ed.), The Labeling of Deviance. Beverly Hills: Sage (2nd ed.).

1969 Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschi, T. & M.J. Hindelang

1977 Intelligence and delinquency: a revisionist review. American Sociological Review, 42, 571-587.

Hopkins, K.D.

1982 The unit of analysis: group means versus individual observations. American Education Research Journal, 19, 5-18.

Hyman, H.H.

1953 The value systems of different classes, in R. Bendix & S. Lipset (eds.), Class, Status, and Power. Glencoe: Free Press.

Israel Ministry of Education and Culture

1985 Education in the Mirror of Numbers. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Israel State Comptroller

1984 Yearly Report No. 35 (1984). Jerusalem: State Comptroller's Office.

Jensen, G.J. & R. Eve

1976 Sex differences in delinquency. Criminology, 13, 427-448.

Johnson, R.

1979 Juvenile Delinquency and its Origins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kahane, R.

1981 Multi-mode institutions: a conceptual framework for the analysis of residential education centers. Alim, 6, 3-15.

Kantor, E.

1983 Work Groups in IDF Bases: An Evaluation Study. Jerusalem: Hebrew University (submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements toward Master's Degree).

Klaff, V.Z.

1977 Residence and integration in Israel: a mosaic of segregated groups. Ethnicity, 4, 103-121.

Kornhauser, R.R.

1970 Social Sources of Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kratcoski, P.C. & L.D. Kratcoski

1979 Juvenile Delinquency. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Krisberg, B. & J. Austin (eds.)

1978 The Children of Ishmael: Critical Perspectives on Juvenile Justice. Palo Alto: Mayfield.

Lemert, E.M.

1972 Human Deviance, Social Problems, and Social Control. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall (2nd ed.).

Linquist, E.F.

1940 Statistical Analysis in Educational Research. New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

Lipton, D., R. Wilkinson & J. Wilks

1975 The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment. New York: Praeger.

Liska, A.E.

1971 Aspirations, expectations, and delinquency: stress and adaptive models. Sociological Quarterly, 12, 99-107.

Martinson, R.

1974 What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. The Public Interest, 35, 220-254.

Merton, R.K.

1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Marwell, G.

1969 Adolescent powerlessness and delinquent behavior, in W.A. Rushing (ed.), Deviant Behavior and Social Process. Rand McNally.

Matras, J., G. Noam & I. Bar-Haim

1984 Young Israelis on the Threshold: A Study of the 1954 Cohort of Israeli Men. Jerusalem: Brookdale Institute of Gerontology and Adult Human Development.

Matza, D. & G.M. Sykes

1961 Juvenile delinquency and subterranean values. American Sociological Review, 38, 712-719.

Menard, S. & B.J. Norse

1984 A structuralist critique of the IQ-delinquency hypothesis: theory and evidence. American Journal of Sociology, 89, 1347-1378.

Merton, R.K.

1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press (revised ed.).

1938 Social structure and anomie. American Sociological Review, 3, 672-682.

Milham, S., R. Bullock & P. Charrett

1975 After Grace - Teeth: A Comparative Study of the Residential Experience of Boys in Approved Schools. London: Human Context Books.

Miller, W.B.

1958 Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 14, 5-19.

Minuchin, S.

1974 Families and Family Therapy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Minuchin, S. & H.C. Fishman

1981 Family Therapy Techniques. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Minuchin, S., B. Montalvo, B.G. Guerney, B.L. Rosman & F. Schumer.

1967 Families of the Slums. New York: Basic Books.

Moos, R.H.

1979a Evaluating Educational Environments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

1979b Social-ecological perspectives on health, in G. Stone, F. Cohen & N. Adler (eds.), Health Psychology: Theories, Applications and Challenges of a Psychological Approach to Health Care. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

1975 Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings. New York: Wiley.

Moos, R.H. & P.M. Insel

1974 Issues in Social Ecology. Palo Alto: National Press.

Page, E.B.

1975 Statistically recapturing the richness within the classroom. Psychology in the Schools, 12, 339-344.

Reckless, W.C.

1969 A new theory of delinquency and crime, in R.S. Cavan (ed.), Readings in Juvenile Delinquency. Lippincott (3rd ed.).

Reckless, W.C.

1962 A non-causal explanation: containment theory. Excerpta Criminalogica, 1, 131-134.

Robinson, W.S.

1950 Ecological correlations and the behavior of individuals. American Sociological Review, 15, 351-357.

Schoenfeld, C.G.

1975 A psychoanalytic theory of juvenile delinquency, in E.E. Peoples (ed.), Readings in Correctional Casework and Counselling. Goodyear.

Schur, E.M.

1973 Radical Non-Intervention: Rethinking the Delinquency Problem. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Schwendinger, H. & J.R. Schwendinger

1977 Social class and the definition of crime. Crime and Social Justice, 7, 4-13.

1976 Marginal youth and social policy. Social Problems, 24, 184-191.

Shah, S.A. & L.H. Roth

1974 Biological and psychophysiological factors in criminality, in D. Glaser (ed.), Handbook of Criminology. Rand McNally.

Shaw, C.R.

1931 The Natural History of a Delinquent Career. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, C.R. & H.D. McKay

1942 Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, C.R. et al.

1929 Delinquency Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shorer, R.

1976 The Night is Theirs: Street-Corner Society in Israel. Hapoalim Library.

Shichor, D.

1972 A typology of institutions for delinquents. Megamot, 12, 71-77.

Simons, R.L.

1978 The meaning of the IQ-delinquency relationship. American Sociological Review, 43, 268-270.

Smith, D.

1979 Sex and deviance: an assessment of major sociological variables. Sociological Quarterly, 20, 183-195.

Smooha, S.

1978 Israel: Pluralism and Conflict. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Smooha, S. & Y. Peres

1975 The dynamics of social inequalities: the case of Israel. Social Dynamics, 1, 63-79.

Spergel, I.

1967 Street Corner Work: Theory and Practice. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Spilerman, S. & J. Habib

1976 Development towns in Israel: the role of community in creating ethnic disparities in labor force characteristics. American Journal of Sociology, 81, 781-812.

Sullivan, C., M.Q. Grant & J.D. Grant

1957 The development of interpersonal maturity: applications to delinquency. Psychiatry, 20, 373-385.

Street, D.

1965 Inmates in custodial and treatment settings. American Sociological Review, 30, 40-55.

Street, D., R.L. Vinter & C. Perrow

1966 Organization for Treatment. New York: Free Press.

Sykes, G.M. & D. Matza

1957 Techniques of neutralization: a theory of delinquency. American Sociological Review, 22, 664-670.

Sutherland, E.H.

1947 Principles of Criminology. L.B. Lippincott (4th ed.).

Tannenbaum, F.

1938 Crime and the Community. New York: Columbia University.

Thrasher, F.M.

1927 The Gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tifft, L.L.

1979 The coming redefinitions of crime: an anarchist perspective. Social Problems, 26, 392-402.

Tittle, C.R., W.J. Villemez & D.A. Smith

1978 The myth of social class and criminality: an empirical assessment of the empirical evidence. American Sociological Review, 43, 643-656.

Tuma, N.B., M.T. Hannan & L.P. Groeneveld

1979 Dynamic analysis of event histories. American Journal of Sociology, 84, 820-854.

Volansky, A. & D. Kfir

1982 National Survey of Youth Advancement 1982: Characteristics, Functioning and Treatment of Disattached Youth in Street Groups. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Wellford, C.

1975 Labeling theory and criminology: an assessment. Social Problems, 22, 332-345.

Wells, L.E.

1978 Theories of deviance and the self-concept. Social Psychology, 41, 189-204.

Wolfgang, M.E., R.M. Figlio & T. Sellin

1972 Delinquency in a Birth Cohort. University of Chicago Press.

Zald, M.

1962 Organizational control structures in five correctional institutions. American Journal of Sociology, 68, 335-345.

1960 The correctional institution for juvenile delinquents. Social Problems, 8, 56-67.

THE NCJW RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATION IN EDUCATION
Jerusalem 91 905
Tel. 02-882016

School of Education
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE

1. In Hebrew

Adler, Chaim.
1980. "The Disadvantaged - An Ethnic or Social Definition." In: Adiel, Shraga; Shalom, Haim; Arieli, Mordechai (eds.). *Fostering Deprived Youth and Residential Education*. Tcherikover Publishers Ltd., Tel Aviv. pp. 60-68.

Adler, Chaim.
1982. "MANOF and KEDMA - Intensive Educational Experiments with Disattached Youth." *Alim*, 50-53.

Adler, Chaim; Inbar, Dan.
1972, *An Evaluation of the Israeli School Reform*. (Publication No. 6). 5 p.

Adler, Chaim.
1985. "School Integration in the Context of the Development of Israel's Educational System," In: *School Desegragation*, Amir, Yehuda; Sharan, Shlomo; Ben-Ari, Rachel (eds.). Am Oved Publishers Ltd., Tel-Aviv. pp. 31-54.

Adler, Chaim; Peleg, Rachel.
1975. *Educational Achievements of Compensatory Education*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 25). 157 p.

Adler, Chaim; Sever, Rita.
1984. *Opportunity and Background: An Outline for the Analysis and Planning of Educational Interventions for the Disadvantaged*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 99). 78 p.

Balgur, Raphael.
1974. "A Basic Word List from Newspapers for the Cultural Disadvantaged." *Megamot*, 20(3):225-253 (Summary in English).

Baumgarten, Dorit.
1982. *A Survey of Community Activities in Secondary School*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 87). 137 p.

Ben-Yishai, Rachel.
1977. Evaluation of Toy Libraries. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 44). 232 p.

Bilsky-Cohen, Rachel (in collaboration with Melnik, Noah).
1972. The Use of Creative Movement for Promoting the Development of Concept Formation and Intellectual Ability in Young Culturally Disadvantaged Children. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 9). 113 p. (2nd Edition 1978). (Also published in English (1974) 89 p.

Cahan, Sorel.
1985. Indices of Entitlement to positive Discrimination in Resource Allocation: A Conceptual Framework. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Publication No. 105. 41 p.

Cahan, Sorel.
1985. Is the Percentage of "Disadvantaged" Students really Decreasing? The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Publication No. 106. 31 p.

Cahan, Sorel.
1985. Hidden Discrimination in the Determination of Children's Entitlement to Compensatory Education. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Publication No. 107. 40 p.

Chen, Michael; Levi, Aryeh; Adler, Chaim.
1978. Process and Outcome in Education: Evaluating the Contribution of the Junior High School to the Educational System. School of Education, Tel Aviv University; and The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 60). 201 p.

Cohen, Jane; Klein, Zeev; Inbar, Michael; Eshel, Yohanan; Adler, Chaim.
Undated. A Position Paper on Educational Integration Programs. Wagner, Naomi (ed.). The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 31). 7 p.

Dar, Yehezkel.
1983. "Academic Frameworks for the Study of the Impacts of Segregation and Integration in Education on Scholastic Achievement." In: Between Education and Psychology. Nisan, Mordecai; Last, Uriel (eds.). School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Magnes Press. pp. 27-56.

Dar, Yehezkel; Resh, Nura.
1985. Classroom Intellectual Composition and Academic Achievement. Megamot, 29(1):22-41.

Davis, Dan; Heller, Eric; Finkelstein, Terri; Kaufman, Lisa.
1983. Computer Assisted Instruction: A Survey of Five Systems. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 94). 81 p.

Davis, Dan; Vinner, Shlomo; Finkelstein, Terri; Regev, Chana.
1986. Observations in School Computer Rooms: Summary and Discussion. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, and The Amos De-Shalit Science Teaching Centre, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Publication No. 110. 21 p.

Druck, Kari; Ben-Yishai, Rachel; Lombard, Avima D.
1981. "Evaluation of Game Libraries." Megamot, 26(3):321-388 (Summary in English).

Druck, Kari; Adler, Chaim.
1984. A Survey of Educational Projects and Evaluation Research, Under the Auspices of Project Renewal. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 101). 295 p.

Eiger, Hinda; Kunik, Naomi.
1977. "Teacher Guidance for Rehabilitation of the Thinking Process of the Underprivileged Pupil." Studies in Education, 15:23-38 (Summary in English).

Eshel, Yohanan; Klein, Zeev; Brickner, Ariela; Persitz, Rachel.
1972. *The Influence of School Integration and the Activity Classroom on Self-Image and Scholastic Achievements in Early Grades of the Elementary School (The Nachlaot Project)*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Internal Publication No. 8). 30 p.

Felsenthal, Ilana.
1984. *Between Promise and Risk: A Pilot Study in Four Residential Educational Institutions in Israel*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 97). 115 p.

Felsenthal, Ilana; Suchi, Ruth; Adler, Chaim.
1977. *An Experiment in Implementing a Service for Young Leaders in a Development Town*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 49). 52 p.

Goor, Amos.
1976. *Description and Evaluation of an Experiment for the Enhancement of Creativity in a Summer Camp*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and The Youth Division, The Ministry of Education and Culture, Israel. (Publication No. 33). 17 p.

Goor, Amos; Rimor, Rivka.
1978. *The Relationship Between Behavioral Indices and Creativity and Between Creativity Tests and Intelligence Tests in Children at the End of Elementary School*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 58). 26 p.

Gordon, Daniela.
1973. "Attentiveness and Educational Achievements in Disadvantaged and Middle-Class 8th-Grade Pupils." *Chavat Daat*, 2:14-22.

Gottlieb, Avi.
1983. *The Rehabilitation of Marginal Youth in Residential Institutions: MANOF and KEDMA*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 86). 119 p.

Gottlieb, Avi.
1987. *Advancement Programs for Disattached Youth: Do They Work?* The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Publication No. 113), 232 p.

Handelman, Don; Sprinzak, Dalia; Basker, Eileen.
1981. *The "Miftan" as a Rehabilitative and Educational Institution. I. Evaluation of the Miftan*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.. (Publication No. 78). 64 p.

Inbar, Dan.
1973. Structural Aspects and Trends in the Operation of the Reform in Hebrew Education. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and School of Education, Tel Aviv University. (Publication No. 16). 20 p. Also published as an article in: Megamot, 21(3):295-305 (Summary in English).

Inbar, Dan; Adler, Chaim; Resh, Nura.
1976. Teachers' Attitudes Towards the School Reform: "Optimism-Pessimism." The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and School of Education, Tel Aviv University. (Publication No. 37). 20 p.

Inbar, Dan; Adler, Chaim; Resh, Nura.
1977. "Ethnic Composition, Integration, Achievement and School Climate." Megamot, 23(3-4):230-237 (Summary in English).

Inbar, Dan; Resh, Nura; Adler, Chaim.
1985. "Integration, School Variables and Teachers," In: School Desegragation, Amir, Yehuda; Sharan, Shlomo; Ben-Ari, Rachel (eds.). Am Oved Publishers Ltd., Tel-Aviv. pp. 121-131.

Inbar, Dan; Sever, Rita.
1986. Second Chance and "External" High Schools. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Publication No. 109. 206 p.

Inbar, Michael, Adler, Chaim.
1983. "The Vulnerable Age: A Serendipitous Finding." In: Between Education and Psychology. Nisan, Mordecai; Last, Uriel (eds.). School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Magnes Press. pp. 103-121.

Kahane, Reuven.
1974. Guidelines for a Sociological Analysis of Informal Youth Organization. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No.21), 20 p. Also published as an article in: Megamot, 21(1):36-46 (Summary in English).

Kahane, Reuven.
1981. "Multi-Code Schools: A Theoretical Framework for the Analysis of Boarding Schools." Alim, 3-5.

Kahane, Reuven.
1983. "Guidelines for an Analysis of Residential Schools." In: Between Education and Psychology. Nisan, Mordecai; Last, Uriel (eds.). School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Magnes Press. pp. 57-74.

Kahane, Reuven; Starr, Laura.
1973. Some Dilemmas of the Vocational-Technological Education System in Israel. The Work and Welfare Studies Institute and School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 13). 91 p.

Kahane, Reuven; Rapoport, Tamar; Zusman, Yaakov.
1975. Guidelines for the Planning of Summer Camps. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and The Youth Division, The Ministry of Education and Culture, Israel. (Publication No. 27). 79 p.

Kahane, Reuven; Rapoport, Tamar.
1978. An Analysis of the Summer Camp Program and Its Influence on Disadvantaged Youth: A Descriptive Survey Made on the Basis of Participant Observation. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 61: Interim Report). 59 p.

Kahane, Reuven; Starr, Laura.
1980. Informal Socialization in Technological Educational Systems. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 70). 13 p.

Kahane, Reuven; Starr, Laura; Polachek, Avri; Kabachnik, Clive.
1982. A Comparative Analysis of Vocational Education Curricula: Their Potential Capacity to Develop Vocational Roles. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 84). 20 p. + Tables and Appendices.

Kahane, Reuven; Starr, Laura.
1984. Education and Work: Vocational Socialization Processes in Israel. Jerusalem. The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 107 p.

Kareev, Yaakov; Silberstein, Paula.
1977. A Report on Interviews with Kindergarten Teachers of Children who had Participated in HIPPY for One Year. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 52). 7 p.

Kareev, Yaakov; Silberstein, Paula.
A Follow-up of the Educational Achievements of the HIPPY Program. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
1977. Interim Report, No. 1: Basic Characteristics of Elder Siblings. (Publication No. 53) 7 p.

1978. *Interim Report*, *No. 2*: *Basic Characteristics of the Research Population in Terms of Hebrew and Arithmetic Achievement Tests and a Classroom Behavior Inventory, and of a Sub-Population on a Test of Concept Formation.* (Publication No. 62). 20 p.
1978. *Interim Report*, *No. 3*: (Publication No. 63). 25 p.
1979. *Interim Report*, *No. 4*: (Publication No. 67). 25 p.
(Davis, Dan; Consultant).

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1973. "The Nachlaot Project": The Activity Classroom in the Integrated School." *Megamot Bachinuch Hapealtani*, The Ministry of Education and Culture, Israel. pp. 119-133.

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1976. *School Integration, Academic Self-Image and Achievement of Lower-Class Elementary School Pupils. (The Nachlaot Project)*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 38). 13 p. Also published as an article in: *Megamot*, 23(3-4):134-158 (1977) (Summary in English).

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1977. "Towards a Psycho-Social Definition of School Integration." *Megamot*, 23(3-4):17-40 (Summary in English).

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1980. *Integration in Elementary Education: Achievements and Implications (The Nachlaot Project)*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 71). 34 p.

Kleinberger, Aharon F.; Resh, Nura; Inbar, Dan; Adler, Chaim.
1973. *The Junior High-School Teachers*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and School of Education, Tel Aviv University. (Publication No. 17). 29 p.

Lior, Sara; Amichai, Shlomit.
1983. *"HAETGAR": Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters*. The NCJW Research Institue for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and The Ministry of Education and Culture. 27 p.

Lombard, Avima; Presser, Bina; Druck Kari.
1979. "The Involvement of Mothers in the Education of Their Disadvantaged Children." *Iyunim Behinuch* *(Studies in Education)*, 23:67-78 (Summary in English).

Mar'i, Sami Khalil.
1974. "School and Society in the Arab Village in Israel." *Iyunim Behinuch* *(Studies in Education)*, 4:85-104 (Summary in English).

Minkowich, Abram; Davis, Dan; Bashi, Joseph.
1980. An Evaluation Study of Israeli Elementary Schools. School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and The Ministry of Education and Culture. Magnes Press, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 425 p. Also Published as a Research Report in English (1977). 464 p.

Nahon; Yaakov, Adler, Chaim.
1985. The Graduates of The Center for Pre-Academic Studies: A Follow-up. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 102). 117 p.

The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
1974. Summary of Research and Activity. (Publication No. 24). 47 p.
1981. Report on Research and Activities No. 6 1981-1982. (Publication No. 79). 63 p.
1985. Report on Research and Activities No. 7 1983-1984. (Publication No. 108). 97 p.

The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
1979. Newsletter No. 1. 2 p.
1980. Newsletter. 19 p.
1980. Newsletter No. 2. 4 p.
1981. Newsletter No. 3. 4 p.
1982. Newsletter No. 4. 7 p.
1983. Newsletter No. 5. 7 p.
1984. Newsletter No. 6. 7 p.
1985. Newsletter No. 7. 8 p.
1986. Newsletter No. 8. 8 p.
1987. Newsletter No. 9. 10 p.

The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
1970. The First Marcus Conference: Perspectives for the Disadvantaged: A Social and Educational Challenge. (Publication No. 3: Description of the Institute Activities; in Hebrew and English). 36 p.
1975. The Second Marcus Conference: New Directions in the Education of Disadvantaged Youth. (Publication No. 29). 44 p.
1981. The Fifth Marcus Conference: Compensatory Education in the 80's: A Look to the Past and at New Developments. Druck, Kari (ed.). (Publication No. 75). 25 p.

Nisan, Mordecai.
1973. The Center for Pre-Academic Studies for Soldiers of Disadvantaged Background: Description, Evaluation and Attempted Analysis. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 15). 186 p.

Ortar, Gina.
1974. "Components of Mothers' Language Contributing to Children's I.Q." Megamot, 21(1):5-12 (Summary in English).

Ortar, Gina.
1975. "An Experiment to Prevent Cultural Retardation in Children by Improving Their Mothers' Speech." Megamot, 21(3):269-276 (Summary in English).

Persitz, Rachel.
1977. Development of Self-Image Among Middle-Class and Lower-Class Elementary School Pupils. M.A. Dissertation submitted to The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 113 p. (Summary in English).

Rapoport, Tamar.
1972. Components of Satisfaction and Assessment in Summer Camps. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Internal Publication No. 11). 45 p.

Rapoport, Tamar.
1980. The Structure of Informal Frameworks and Their Impact on Youth: Case Study of Summer Camps. Ph.D. Dissertation submitted to The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 480 p. (Summary in English).

Rapoport, Tamar; Zadok, Yael.
1972. Preliminary Report on "Oded Summer Camp 1972. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Internal Publication No. 12). 38 p.

Rapoport, Tamar; Appelbaum, M.; Kahane, Reuven.
1975. Participation in an Informal Educational Structure (the Summer Camp) and Its Impact on the Development of Resources: Analysis of Participants' Essays. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 30). 35 p.

Rapoport, Tamar; Kahane, Reuven.
1977. The Perception of Informal Organizations: The Case of Summer Camps. The Ministry of Education and Culture, Jerusalem; and The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Internal Publication No. 54). 39 p.

Rapoport, Tamar; Peled, Yigal; Sheinberg, Andre; Kahane, Reuven.
1977. The Measurement of Structural Dimensions of Informal Youth Organizations: Criteria for Participant Observation in Summer Camps. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 55: Interim Report). 19 p.

Rapoport, Tamar; Kahane, Reuven.
1978. The Mutual Relations Between Structural Dimensions of Informal Educational Organizations. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Internal Publication No. 64). 21 p.

Rapoport, Tamar; Soffer, Laura; Kahane, Reuven.
1978. Role Perception in Informal Organizations. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 65: Interim Report). 39 p.

Resh, Nura.
1982. Family Background, School Selection, Parents' Aspirations and High School Track Placement. Ph. D. Dissertation submitted to The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 177 p. + Indices. (Summary in English.)

Resh, Nura.
1984. A Survey of Teachers in Their "Sabbatical Year." The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 100). 69 p.

Resh, Nura; Adler, Chaim; Chen, Michael; Inbar, Dan.
1976. Teachers and Junior High School Policy. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; and School of Education, Tel Aviv University. (Publication No. 41). 14 p.

Resh, Nura; Inbar, Dan; Adler, Chaim.
1977. "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Educational Aims and Social Integration in the Junior High School." Megamot, 23(3-4):221-229 (Summary in English).

Resh, Nura; Adler, Chaim; Chen, Michael; Inbar, Dan.
1979. "Teachers and Junior High School Policy." Iyunim Behinuch (Studies in Education), 23:39-52 (Summary in English):

Resh, Nura; Adler, Chaim; Inbar, Dan.
1980. *Educational Initiatives and Innovations in Junior High Schools Coping with Heterogeneous Student Populations*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 72). 151 p.

Resh, Nura; Adler, Chaim
1981. *The Development and Activity of a New Junior High School: A Follow-up and Scientific Consultation in the Sieff Junior High School*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 77). 15 p.

Resh, Nura; Adler, Chaim; Inbar, Dan.
1982. "Teachers' Perception of Problems in Junior High Schools." *Studies in Educational Administration*, 10:69-84.

Sela, Avi; Adler, Chaim.
1983. *Project "NOAH": Youth Studying Their Community*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 88). 130 p. + Appendix of Students' Research Reports, 421 p.

Sever, Rita.
1983. *Untying the Gordian Knot: Processes of Human Judgment as Reflected in Judges' Reports and in Models Based on Computer Analysis*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 93). 65 p. (M.A. Dissertation submitted to The Hebrew University of Jerusalem). (Summary in English).

Shamgar-Handelman, Lea; Belkin, Ruth.
1977. *Patterns of Space Allocation in Dwelling Units in Jerusalem Neighborhoods*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 56). 40 p.

Shamgar-Handelman, Lea; Belkin, Ruth.
1978. *Family Functions and Children's Achievement in School*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 66). 42 p. (Also published in English (1979). 64 p.).

Shamgar-Handelman, Lea.
1985. Social Mobility and Social Networks in "Disadvantaged" Families in Jerusalem. In: *Social Networks in Processes of Integration*, Ahimeir, Ora; Idan, Yaron, Eds. The Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies. No. 13, pp. 35-55.

Sharan, Shlomo.
1971. The Development of Sorting Ability of Preschool Disadvantaged Children. The Ministry of Education and Culture, Jerusalem. 83 p.

Sharlin, Lida; Druck, Kari.
1983. The Hebrew University Apprenticeship Program. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 92). 91 p.

Sharlin, Lida.
1986. The Apprenticeship Project: A Six Year Follow-Up. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Publication No. 112), 62 p.

Silberstein, Paula.
1978. The Effect on Tutors of Participating in HIPPY in terms of Variables Related to Childrearing. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 97 p. (M.A. Dissertation submitted to The Hebrew University of Jerusalem) (Summary in English).

Silberstein, Paula; Kareev, Yaakov; Davis, Dan.
1982. An Evaluation of the Educational Impact of HIPPY (Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters). The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 81). 19 p. (Also published in English. 23 p.).

Smilansky, Jonathan; Baumgarten, Dorit.
1981. Community Schools - a Description and Evaluation. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 76). 152 p.

Smilansky, Jonathan, Baumgarten, Dorit.
1982. "Alternative Approaches to the Implementation of Community Schools." Iyunim Behinuch (Studies in Education), 35:191-208.

Smilansky, Jonathan; Bar-Lev, Miriam.
1984. Approaches to Dealing with Classroom Discipline Problems. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 95). 87 p.

Sprinzak, Dalia.
1976. Evaluative Research of the Tutorial Program. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 42). 153 p.

Starr, Laura.
1982. *Structure and Process in Occupational Socialization: A Sociological Analysis of Vocational Curricula in Israel*. Ph. D. Dissertation submitted to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Summary in English). 116 p. + Indices.

Starr, Laura; Kahane, Reuven.
1977. *Socialization and Formation of Occupational Status: The Influence of Technological Education in Israel on Its Pupils' Expectations*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education; and The Eshkol Institute, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Internal Publication No. 48). 35 p.

Tamir, Pinchas.
undated. *Teaching Science to First-Grade Pupils in Israel by the Audio-Tutorial Method*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education; and The Amos De-Shalit Science Teaching Centre, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 13 p. Also published as an article in English in *Science Education*, 59(1):39-49 (1975).

Weil, Shalva
1985. *The Dynamics of Community Schools in Israel: An Ethnography*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 103). 171 p.

2. In English

Adler, Chaim.
undated. Deprivation and Disadvantage in Israel. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 169 p.

Adler, Chaim.
1969. "Education and the Integration of Immigrants in Israel." The International Migration Review, III:3-19.

Adler, Chaim.
1974. "Social Stratification and Education in Israel." Comparative Education Review, 18:10-23.

Adler, Chaim.
1976. "Educational Fostering and Social Integration: A Sociologist's View." In: Teaching as a Social Challenge. Frankenstein, C., (ed.). School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. pp. 95-100.

Adler, Chaim.
1979. "Education of the Disadvantaged in Israel: Assessment and Future Challenges." In: The United States-Israel Educational Policy Colloquium Papers. Jerusalem. 7 p. + Tables.

Adler, Chaim.
1980. "The Evaluation of the Israeli School Reform." In: Law and Equality in Education. Goldstein, S., (ed.). The Van Leer Jerusalem Foundation, Jerusalem. pp. 53-59.

Adler, Chaim.
1984. "School Integration in the Context of the Development of Israel's Educational System," In: School Desegregation, Amir, Y; Sharan, S; Ben-Ari, R. (eds.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. pp. 21-46.

Adler, Chaim; Ichilov, Orit; Kahane, Reuven; Lotan, Michael.
1972. An Action Statement. The NCJW Center for Research in the Education of the Disadvantaged, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 7). 60 p.

Adler, Chaim; Kahane, Reuven; Avgar, Amy.
1974. A Master Plan for Research in the Education of the Disadvantaged in Israel. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 18). 187 p.

Adler, Chaim; Kahane, Reuven; Avgar, Amy.(1)
1975. The Education of the Disadvantaged in Israel: Comparisons, Analysis and Proposed Research. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 26). 208 p.

---

(1) ERIC ED 164 629

Adler, Chaim; Ohayon, Yaacov; Freund, David.(2)
1981. "MANOF and KEDMA: Intensive Educational Experiences for Marginal Youth." In: Residential Education in Israel, Report of the Israeli-American Seminar on Out of School Education. The Ministry of Education and Culture, Jerusalem. pp. 143-152.

Adler, Chaim; Melzer-Druker, Pessy.(2a)
1983. A Survey of Evaluations of Educational Intervention Programs Sponsored by Project Renewal. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 90). 209 p. + Bibliography.

Bilski-Cohen, Rachel (in collaboration with Melnik, Noa).(3)
1974. The Use of Creative Movement for Promoting the Development of Concept Formation and Intellectual Ability in Young Culturally Disadvantaged Children. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 19). 89 p. (Also published in Hebrew (1972, 1978). 113 p.).

Carmi, Gideon.
1984. Early Detection and Development of Three Cognitive Concepts in Low to Middle-Class Children. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education; and The Amos De-Shalit Science Teaching Centre; The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. [illegible]). 118 p.

Dar, Yehezkel (in collaboration with Resh, Nura).(4)
1981. Homogeneity and Heterogeneity in Education. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 73). 194 p.

Dar, Yehezkel; Resh, Nura.
1986. Classroom Composition and Pupil Achievement. A Study of the Effect of Ability-Based Classes. Gordon and Bearch Science Publishers, Inc., 200 p.

Davis, Dan; Kugelmass, Judith.(5)
1974. Home Environment: The Impact of the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) on the Mother's Role as Educator. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 20). 41 p.

Davis, Dan; Cahan, Sorel, Bashi, Joseph.
1977. "Birth Order and Intellectual Development - The Confluence Model in the Light of Cross-Cultural Evidence." Science, 196:1470-1472.

---

(2) ERIC ED 215 049
(2a) ERIC ED 238 969
(3) ERIC ED 164 681
(4) ERIC ED 220 543
(5) ERIC ED 164 680

Davis, Dan; Snapiri, Tchia; Golan, Pnina.
1984. A Survey of Tutoring Activities in Israel and Associated Evaluation Studies. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 96). 54 p.

Davis, Dan; Vinner, Shlomo; Finkelstein, Terri; Regev, Chana.
1986. Observations in School Computer Rooms. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, and the Amos DE-Shalit Science Teaching Center, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Publication No. 111. 124 p.

Eshel, Yohanan; Klein, Zeev.
1977. Development of Academic Self Concept of Lower-Class and Middle-Class Primary school Children. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 43). 21 p.

Goldberg, Harvey.
1976. Evaluation Research on a Program for Disadvantaged Youth in an Israeli Development Town. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 32). 43 p.

Goldberg, Harvey.
1979. "A Program for Disadvantaged Youth in an Israeli Development Town: An Evaluation." Anthropology and Education Quarterly, X:21-42.

Goldberg, Harvey, E.
1984. Greentown's Youth. Disadvantaged Youth in a Development Town in Israel. Van Gorcum, Assen. The Netherlands. 158 p.

Goldberg, Harvey, E.
1984. "Evaluation, Ethnography, and the Concept of Culture. Disadvantaged Youth in an Israeli Town." In: Fetterman, D.M. (ed.), Ethnography in Educational Evaluation. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi, pp. 153-173.

Goor, Amos.
1977. The Concrete Attitude and the Abstract Attitude in Creative Thinking. Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beersheba. 17 p.

Goor, Amos.
1978. Time and Tension in the Incubation Phase of the Creative Process. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 57). 17 p.

Goor, Amos; Rapoport, Tamar.
1977. *Enhancing Creativity in an Experimental Summer Camp: A Context-Content Analysis of Creativity in an Informal Education Framework*. The Youth Division of the Ministry of Education and Culture, Jerusalem; and The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 45). 20 p.

Goor, Amos; Rapoport, Tamar.
1977. "Enhancing Creativity in an Informal Educational Framework". *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69:636-643.

Goor, Amos; Rimor, Rivka.
1978. *Indices of Creative Behavior in Preadolescent Children*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 59). 21 p. + tables.

Green, Henry A.; Cohen, Jane.(6)
1979. *Research in Action*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The Hamakor Press, Jerusalem. (Publication No. 68). 131 p.

Handelman, Don; Basker, Eileen.
1977. *The Referral Process, 1976-1977: Miftan Ramle, Miftan Jerusalem*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 46). 37 p.

Handelman, Don; Sprinzak, Dalia; Basker, Eileen.
1981. *The "Miftan" as a Rehabilitative and Educational Institution. II. The Organization of Education and Social Relations in Three Vocational Schools (Miftanim) for Elementary School Dropouts*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 78). 357 p.

Inbar, Dan.
1981. "The Paradox of Feasible Planning: The Case of Israel." *Comparative Education Review*, 25:13-27.

Inbar, Dan; Resh, Nura. (7)
1983. *Learning of the Disadvantaged and School Climate*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 89). 125 p.

---

(6) ERIC ED 183 629

(7) ERIC ED 233 089

Inbar, Dan; Resh, Nura; Adler, Chaim.
1984. "Integration and School Variables," In: School Desegregation, Amir, Y; Sharan, S; Ben-Ari, R. (eds.), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., pp. 119-132.

Inbar, Michael.
1976. The Vulnerable Age Phenomenon. New York, Russel Sage Foundation Basic Books. 54 p.

Inbar, Michael.(8)
1981. Some Effects of Stress During Grade School Years. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 74). 56 p. (Also published as a chapter in: Stress in Israel. Breznitz, S. (ed.), Van Nostrand Reinhold Company Inc. 1983.)

Inbar, Michael.(9)
1982. Images or Aberrations? Human Judgment and Insight as Reflected in Current Regression Analyses. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 83). 71 p.

Inbar, Michael; Adler, Chaim.
1976. "The Vulnerable Age: A Serendipitous Finding". Sociology of Education, 49:193-200.

Inbar, Michael; Adler, Chaim.
1977. Ethnic Integration in Israel: A Comparative Case Study of Moroccan Brothers who Settled in France and Israel. Transaction Books, New Brunswick, N.J., 144 p.

Kahane, Reuven.
1974. Structures and Uses of Informal Youth Educational Organizations: An Analytical Framework. Department of Sociology and School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 36 p.

Kahane, Reuven.
1975. "Informal Youth Organizations: A General Model." Sociological Inquiry, 45(4):17-28.

---

(8) ERIC ED 219 463
(9) ERIC ED 227 181

Kahane, Reuven.
1975. "The Committed: Preliminary Reflections on the Impact of the Kibbutz Socialization Pattern on Adolescents." The British Journal of Sociology, 26(3): 343-353.

Kahane, Reuven.(10)
1981. "Multi-Code Schools: A Theoretical Framework for the Analysis of Boarding Schools." In: Residential Education in Israel, Report of the Israeli-American Seminar on Out of School Education. Ministry of Education and Culture, Jerusalem. pp. 111-116.

Kahane, Reuven.
1986. "Informal Agencies of Socialization and the Integration of Immigrant Youth into Society: An Example from Israel," International Migration Review, 20(1):21-39.

Kahane, Reuven; Rapoport, Tamar; Soffer, Laura.
1979. The Impact of Informal Educational Frameworks on Disadvantaged Youth: The Case of Summer Camps. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 50 p.

Kahane, Reuven; Rapoport, Tamar.
1981. The Impact of Informal Educational Frameworks on Disadvantaged Youth. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 15 p.

Kahane, Reuven; Starr, Laura.
1974. Education under Cross Pressures: The Case of Vocational-Technological Education in Israel. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 22). 33 p.

Kahane, Reuven; Starr, Laura.
1975. Toward Prediction of Role Commitment: The Case of the Technical Teacher. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 28). 32 p.

Kahane, Reuven; Starr, Laura.
1976. "The Impact of Rapid Social Change on Technological Education: An Israeli Example." Comparative Education Review, 20(2):165-178.

---

(10) ERIC ED 215 049

Kahane, Reuven; Starr, Laura.
1976. *School Attractiveness, Pupil Image and Expectations of Program Completion: The Case of the Technological Educational System in Israel*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education; and Department of Sociology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 36). 20 p.

Kareev, Yaakov; Davis, Dan; Silberstein, Paula.(11)
1982. *An Evaluation of the Educational Impact of HIPPY (Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters)*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 85). 23 p. (Also published in Hebrew, 19 p.).

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1971. *A Study of an Integration and Special Intervention Project in Elementary Schools*. The NCJW Center for Research in Education of the Disadvantaged, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 5). 24 p.

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan. (12)
1976. *A Further Investigation of the Effects of Integration and Special Educational Intervention in the Early Primary Grades*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 39). 19 p.

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1977. *The Effects of Integration and Special Educational Intervention in the Early Primary Grades*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 50). 12 p. + Tables.

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1977. *The Open Classroom in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 16 p. (Also published as an article in *Sociology of Education*, 1980, 53:114-121).

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1980. *Integrating Jerusalem Schools*. Academic Press, Inc. 175 p.

---

(11) ERIC ED 227 180
(12) ERIC ED 164 683

Klein, Zeev; Eshel, Yohanan.
1980. "The NACHLAOT Project: An Israeli Experiment in School Integration." In: Law and Equality in Education. Goldstein, S., (ed.). The Van Leer Jerusalem Foundation, Jerusalem. pp. 69-83.

Lombard, Avima D.(13)
1973. Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY). The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 14). 130 p.

Lombard, Avima D.
1982. "HIPPY: Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters." In: Early Childhood Education: International Perspectives. Nir-Janiv, N.; Spodek, B. & Steg, D., (eds.). Plenum Press. pp. 215-221.

Lombard, Avima D. (14)
1981. Success Begins at Home: Educational Foundations for Preschoolers. Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company. 176 p.

Lombard, Avima D.
1982. "Funf Jahre Freiheit: Vorschulerziehung." In: Erziehung in Israel I. Ackerman, W.; Carmon, A.; and Zucker, D. (eds.), Klett-Cotta. pp. 349-366 (in German).

Lombard, Avima D.; Kugelmass, Judith. (15)
1976. Home Activities for Toddlers and Their Families (HATAF). The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 35). 47 p.

Lombard, Avima D. and Nissel, Hannah
1982. Home Activities for Toddlers and Their Families (HATAF). The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 82). 11 p.

Minkowich, Abram; Davis, Dan; Bashi, Joseph.
1977. An Evaluation Study of Israeli Elementary Schools. School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 464 p. (Also published as a book in Hebrew (1980). 425 p.).

---

(13) ERIC ED 164 679
(14) ERIC ED 210 119
(15) ERIC ED 218 368

Minkowich, Abram; Klein, Zeev; Last, Uriel. (16)
1977. Two Types of Cognitive Functioning in Primary and Secondary Retardation. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 47). 13 p.

The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
1970. Annual Report (See 1st Marcus Conference in the Hebrew List) No. 1 (Pub. No. 3).
1971. Annual Report No. 2 (Pub. No. 4). 36 p.
1972. Annual Report No. 3 1971-1972 (Pub. No. 10). 27 p.
1974. Bi-Annual Report No. 4 1973-1974 (Pub. No. 23). 58 p.
1976. Bi-Annual Report No. 5 1975-1976 (Pub. No. 34). 53 p.
1982. Report on Research and Activities No. 6 1981-1982 (Pub. No. 80). 83 p.(17)
1985. Report of Research and Activities No. 7 1983-84 (Pub. No. 104). 118 p.

The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
1982. HIPPY International Workshop (December 5-20,1982). Recorded and written by Kay Weinberger. (Publication. No. 91). 47 p.

Ortar, Gina.
1969. An Analysis of Mother's Speech as a Factor in the Development of Children's Intelligence. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 111 p.

Peleg, Rachel; Adler, Chaim.
1977. "Compensatory Education in Israel: Conceptions, Attitudes and Trends." American Psychologist, 32(11):945-958.

Sela, Avi; Adler, Chaim.
1983. Project "NOAH": Youth Studying Their Community. The Dimona Project. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 27 p. An abstract of report published in Hebrew, 130 p. + pupils' reports 421 p.

Shavit-Streifler, Yossi Jonathan.
1983. Tracking in Israeli Education: Its Consequences for Ethnic Inequalities in Educational Attainment. Ph.D. Dissertation Submitted to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA. 180 p.

---

(16) ERIC ED 164 682
(17) ERIC ED 224 850

Shamgar-Handelman, Lea (ed.).
1986. Unpaid Work in the Family Setting. Israel Social Science Reseach, Vol. 4, No. 1. (A special issue).

Shamgar-Handelman, Lea; Belkin, Ruth.(18)
1979. Family Functioning and Children's Achievements in School. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 69). 64 p. (Also published in Hebrew, (1978) 42 p.).

Starr, Laura; Kahane, Reuven.
1976. Technological Education and Vocational Identity: A Case Study. The NCJW Research Institute for Innovation in Education, School of Education; and Department of Sociology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 40). 25 p.

Tannenbaum, Abraham; Lombard, Avima.
1969. Early Intellective Stimulation Project. The NCJW Center for Research in Education of the Disadvantaged, School of Education, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Publication No. 1). 11p.

Yuchtman-Yaar, Ephraim; Inbar, Michael.
1986. Social Distance in the Israeli-Arab Conflict. A Resource-Dependency Analysis. Comparative Political Studies, 19(3):283-316.

---

(18) ERIC ED 186 510